UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

+ + + + +

NATIONAL ORGANIC STANDARDS BOARD

+ + + + +

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 17, 2005

+ + + + +

The above-entitled matter convened at 8:00 a.m., in Oriental Ballroom C of the Mandarin Oriental Hotel, 1330 Maryland Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C., James A. Riddle, Chairperson, presiding.

NOSB MEMBERS PRESENT:

JAMES RIDDLE Chairperson KEVIN R. O'RELL Vice Chairperson GOLDIE CAUGHLAN Secretary ANDREA CAROE Member DAVID CARTER Member Member GERALD DAVIS BEA E. JAMES Member HUBERT J. KARREMAN Member ROSALIE KOENIG Member Member MICHAEL P. LACY NANCY M. OSTIGUY Member Member GEORGE SIEMON JULIE S. WEISMAN Member

NOP STAFF PRESENT:

KATHERINE BENHAM
MARK BRADLEY
KEITH JONES
ARTHUR NEAL
BARBARA C. ROBINSON

NEAL R. GROSS

$A\!-\!G\!-\!E\!-\!N\!-\!D\!-\!A$

		<u>PAGE</u>
I.	Public Comment Session	5
II.	Presentation and Discussion of Committee Work Plans and Timelines	121
III.	Set Next Meeting Date	153
IV.	Closing Remarks - James Riddle, Chair	155
V.	Adiourn	161

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

(8:09 a.m.)

CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: If people could take their seats, it's time for public comment. I suppose I need to read the rules again.

As stated on the agenda and in the Federal Register notice, we'll start our day today with another round of public comments. And for your information, I have 17 people so far that have signed up to provide comments. The book is still out on the back table, if you so choose, if you haven't signed up yet.

Once again, if there are any new faces in the crowd that didn't hear the policy for public comments, I'll just briefly go through that before we start. In order to offer public comments, you must sign up in advance, and we'll follow the order that people have signed up.

If I call your name and you're not present, we'll go ahead and move on. But then I'll call your name at the end if you're there, but you'll bounce to the end if you're not present at the time

when I call your name.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

You'll have five minutes to speak. You could carry a proxy and have an additional five. Ιf that is the case, please state that at the very beginning, so that Goldie knows. And Goldie will be keeping time and has а one-minute warning somewhere that she'll hold up when you have one minute But like I said on Monday, if you don't see that sign, that's not her problem. It's just a courtesy to you.

But when the timer rings, I'll allow you to conclude your remarks, conclude that thought, if members of the Board have questions, and there could be additional remarks in response to questions.

And then, the final rule, individuals providing public comment will refrain from personal attacks and remarks that otherwise impugn the character individual, or company for of any matter. And as I said, we certainly don't mind passion, but we don't want any personal attacks.

And the comments on Monday were just excellent, a lot of passion and no offensive remarks,

1	unless you mind a little swearing.
2	(Laughter.)
3	But it was not directed at anyone, just
4	the whole Board and everyone in general.
5	(Laughter.)
6	PARTICIPANT: Compliments and jokes are
7	accepted.
8	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: Yes. Well,
9	compliments could impugn on the character of an
10	individual as well. Anyway, we will go ahead and get
11	started, and I'll read the name of the person up, and
12	also the person on deck. So first up is Mark Kastel,
13	with Tony Azevedo on deck.
14	MR. KASTEL: Good morning. My name is
15	Mark Kastel, K-A-S-T-E-L, and I'm here today
16	representing the Cornucopia Institute based in
17	Cornucopia, Wisconsin.
18	Goldie, I have a proxy not from Henry
19	Perkins, but once again from Maury Johnson. So you're
20	safe, Jim.
21	(Laughter.)
22	Okay. First, the good news. We want to

convey our thanks to the NOSB.

(Laughter.)

One person has to do this at every meeting. I don't know why it had to be me.

First of all, thank you very much for passing the guidance document on pasture that you did yesterday in support of protecting the organic dairy brand. And we appreciate the hard work, long hours, and especially listening to the diverse stakeholders in the issue.

We also want to convey our thanks to the Livestock Committee for renewing your efforts to pass a substantive rule change with teeth.

And now a note to the NOP. Get the gavel ready. You asked the Board specifically to revisit the pasture guidance document that was passed unanimously in 2001, and went unaddressed by the Department, languishing until this January when this hot button issue again caught fire.

The dairy producers now ask you -- you asked for this in January. We now ask you to please post this document, send it to all certifiers on an

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

immediate basis, without delay.

Okay. That's all the good news. Now, let's talk about the bad news. There won't be any flowery prose, and there won't be any swearing, and there won't be any disrespect. But in the words of my favorite philosopher, Rosanna Anna Danna --

(Laughter.)

-- I keep getting more and more cynical all the time. I just can't keep up.

I don't understand. We have some really good people working at the National Organic Program. When you put this rule back, when you turned it back to the Board and said you don't understand, I don't understand. What part of access to pasture do you folks not get? This has been a Board agenda item since 2000.

The delay has allowed a number of industrial farms, with allegedly almost exclusive confinement conditions, to operate. Farmers have spent thousands of dollars and hundreds of hours to participate in this process and feel disrespected.

Sending the NOSB-endorsed rule on pasture

NEAL R. GROSS

back to this Board the way you did was just plain wrong. The question was about regulatory intent. In the 2001 document, which is on record, endorsed by this Board, there was a paragraph entitled "Intent." It's clear to everyone in this room what the intent of that process was, I think.

You could have, optionally, talked to the Board before you caught them flat-footed and us flat-footed, and engaged in a dialogue if you thought there was something deficient in the language that they crafted. Better yet, from a timing standpoint, the NOP could have crafted alternative language.

If you said, "Look, let's maintain the spirit of what the Board crafted, but we think the language isn't compatible with the regulations, or it isn't in the right legalese," or whatever the excuses were, I don't understand. But you could have crafted that language and presented it back to the Board on Monday and said, "Look, we think this is the good wording. We'd like you to bless it. If you will pass it today, we will then take it and post it on the Federal Register."

We're talking about years until enforcement can take place at this point. We have to revisit this at the Board. You folks have to review this again. It has to be posted, comments, and then once — once it's passed, we're going to give farms that aren't in compliance some amount of time to file a new plan and come into compliance. We feel bad about this.

If we're talking about a participatory democratic system, which is what this organic movement was founded on, this is disrespectful. And I want to mention two other things that we're very concerned about.

One is you folks solicited public comments that were due in May. You took those into consideration. We were appalled to find that about a month after the deadline of May 20th passed, before the Livestock Committee met, that about a third of the comments had not been passed to the Board members or posted on the NOP website.

This was not a casual dialogue with stakeholders. This was a formal public comment period

NEAL R. GROSS

to benefit Board decisionmaking. That was just unacceptable.

The fact that there were 11 institutional comments that were listed by -- under the submitter's name -- Cornucopia's was listed under my colleague, W. Fantle's name. A lot of folks in the organic community would not recognize M. Kastel or W. Fantle. They might not recognize P. Odek as being the CEO of Wild Oats.

And to create a dialogue, rank and file farmers, consumers, and other NGOs would like to see the comments and the thoughts of other learned people in the industry. We need to do a better job on the democratic dialogue.

And, finally, and it might seem trivial, but this type of hotel is not conducive, and this location in Washington, D.C. in August is not conducive for public participation. Farmers who got the great deal and paid \$30 a night for parking, paid \$200 -- over \$200 a night for accommodations, we -- if you didn't get in on that deal, it was over \$300 a night. Breakfast, \$19.

I talked to a farm couple yesterday who said, "Well, we didn't want to pay \$19 for breakfast, so we opted for the \$6 bagel." And the wife corrected him and said, "No, honey, that was the \$7 bagel. You went for the optional cream cheese."

(Laughter.)

Lunch, we wanted to have a farmer lunch on Monday -- \$40 in our \$700 rented meeting room. Listen, for a lot less in the aggregate, we could meet again in LaCrosse, Wisconsin. We'd welcome you there. Farmers could find \$50 hotel rooms, and, you know, \$8 breakfast, and we'd treat you guys.

So as un-PC as this might sound, we will continue to bang the drum for democracy in this process. We love the organic food and farming movement. I mean, that's what -- the reason most of us are enduring these long meetings, especially you folks.

We love the energy and the collaborative environment that this community was founded on, and we refuse to give up this lucrative market that is now created -- some people will call it an industry -- to

those who just care about crap.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

And we -- we want to -- we want to engage with the Department on good governance. And I think you folks as individuals -- I see you shaking your head, Mark -- are good folks, and you want to also. I don't get it. I don't know if it's coming from the Secretary's office, where this, you know, block we have is taking place.

But last year when those quidance documents were issued by the NOP, collaborating with anyone, you guys got critical, you know, set of instructions from then-Secretary Veneman about collaborating. And then, we have this rule come back without collaborating. So you can issue edicts, or you can, you know, kind of through neglect maybe make decisions, but we need to have a dialogue.

So lastly, a message to the investors who own the industrial firms.

Thank you, Goldie.

And this isn't the first time I've given this message. The organic community has spoken. It's

NEAL R. GROSS

very, very clear what the consensus is in terms of expecting dairy cattle to graze, not have access to 15,000 acres in the desert, not have, you know, temporary confinement for 305 days worth of lactation.

None of this might carry the weight of law today. But you know what? The regulations are in force. Most dairy producers understand that. And if you want to continue down the road of investing millions in these confinement operations, you're doing so at your risk and the risk of your investors. And, by God, we still have a Securities and Exchange Commission that requires disclosure, and you'd better be telling those investors how off the path you are.

That's the end of my comments, and thanks for enduring that, and thanks for not gaveling me down.

(Laughter.)

CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: Thanks, Mark, your pointed comments. I do have a comment myself. won't have a question, but I do just want to clarify. rule change draft, Keith pasture of the Livestock contacted me and other members

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Committee that there were some problems with that draft, and there was a dialogue occurring to try and clarify our intent.

And I think -- you know, I don't know, and I can't speak for Keith on this, but I know there's a lot of other items on their work schedules. And it certainly is possible that it could -- and you don't need to respond, I'm not --

MR. KASTEL: Well, I --

CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: Please do not. Please do not. So there was a dialogue underway, and, yes, it did catch us flat-footed as you say to have it thrown back. And, yes, I would have appreciated -- and I know other members of the Board would have appreciated -- kind of a conclusion to that dialogue that we were engaged in, giving us a warning that it was coming back.

But there was a dialogue under way, and I guess I see more progress than we've ever had in the feedback loop that's now occurring. And we've set a precedent at this meeting that I hope can continue into the future, where we hear a line-by-line report

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

_	on our recommendations and now they re being received
2	by the program.
3	And as an Advisory Board, you know, we
4	can't expect to have every one of our recommendations
5	adopted, especially in a three-month time period. But
6	we do deserve to know where the program stands, and
7	that is exactly what's happening. And when it's
8	appropriate, it's a lot better to have those
9	recommendations given back to us for further work than
LO	to just be rejected out of hand, or ignored and that
L1	was the case for a number of years.
L2	So you may get more cynical as time goes
L3	on, but I see progress in very small steps. So it's
L4	just a different perspective.
L5	That's okay. We'll move on. I appreciate
L6	your comments.
L7	Tony Azevedo, and then Diane Goodman.
L8	MR. AZEVEDO: I'm back.
L9	(Laughter.)
20	That's Tony Azevedo, A-Z-E-V-E-D-O. I
21	have a proxy from some very good friends. My dairy is
22	in California. These dairy folks

1	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: So you'll have 10
2	MS. CAUGHLAN: Are you doing a 10-
3	minute
4	MR. AZEVEDO: I hope not. I can wrap this
5	up really fast.
6	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: Okay. You do have a
7	proxy.
8	MR. AZEVEDO: Yes. Do you want it?
9	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: No, that's fine.
10	MR. SIEMON: Who is it?
11	MR. AZEVEDO: The proxy? It's Tom and
12	Sally Brown from Groton, New York. And they signed
13	up. So they're
14	MS. CAUGHLAN: That's fine.
15	MR. AZEVEDO: I'll read this letter that
16	they had me read. They were here, but they had to
17	leave early.
18	"My husband and I have been farming for 27
19	years. We are the third generation farm and a few
20	years short of having a 100-year farm. If we had not
21	started farming organically, we would have been forced
22	out of business with nothing to show for 27 years of

labor.

"We milk 100 cows. Farms of this size are close to being an endangered species. With exception, most will go out of business. We're losing more and more of the rapidly-disappearing family farms on the American landscape.

"Support of the pasture ruling will allow many of these farms to continue. Also, as the average age of the American farmer is 55, in 10 years there will be a serious need for young farmers.

"Thank you very much."

The only thing I'd like to add to that is obviously you folks probably caught the fact that I was very disappointed with not accepting the rule. But the guidance document was kind of a ray of light.

It's very important that we do have some guidance in the west, because we have many farmers that want to get into organics, and we want to bring them in. And these are young farmers, and in the west many of these young farmers suffer from an affliction called productitis. And that's where you finish four years of an agricultural college, which they basically

teach you three things -- produce, produce, produce -- and now they'd like to get into organics, and they need to know, you know, where they stand.

And by having some kind of rule, guidance
-- and the guidance document is going to help a lot.
But it -- prolonging this is going to make a larger
problem. And I know there's a possibility of having a
meeting in November.

And if the Livestock Committee could just come up with a simple statement that the NOP could get behind -- and when I say a "simple statement" it's going to be kind of an ongoing work, but a statement, zero pasture for a lactating cow does not constitute organic.

Now, that's something that's simple. You couple it up with the guidance document, and a lot of these young farmers can get on their way. And it's not completely clear, but it's something. But to prolong this year after year is going to be very damaging.

So I was hoping that possibly the NOSB would consider, while we're putting this thing

NEAL R. GROSS

together, to get NOP to at least come up with a statement that young people from the west in my area realize, well, a statement like that, coupled up with a guidance document, at least they have somewhere to go and kind of formulate their dairy setups.

And these are young people that are coming

-- their parents are -- have large conventional farms,

and they want to do the right thing. They really

don't like what their parents are doing, and so they

want to do something different. They want to do

something new.

But all the institutions in the west have not taught them anything about organics, which we know that. So they're looking at -- at groups like this, and at kind of old dogs like me, to tell them what to do. And I don't -- I don't want to misguide them.

I don't want to say, "No, no, you've got to do this, this, and this," which I do that a lot, but, I mean, I don't want to do that and come out wrong. You know? So perhaps you could consider in November when you do meet to at least come out with a statement that would kind of clarify, you know, zero

1	pasture for a lactating cow does not constitute
2	organic. That's pretty clear. That's pretty clear.
3	And coupled up with the guidance document I think it
4	will work.
5	I'm not recommending that be the rule.
6	There's a lot more to it than that, but at least it
7	would give these young people an avenue to go down, so
8	they can continue with getting in agriculture, because
9	we are very short of organic milk. And we have a lot
10	of folks that want to get in it but are just, gee,
11	where are we going with this?
12	Other than any questions, I want to thank
13	everybody. Are there any questions?
14	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: I've got Hugh.
15	MR. KARREMAN: Tony, thank you for that
16	rule proposal, zero pasture does not constitute
17	organic production.
18	MR. AZEVEDO: Well, please don't look at
19	that as a rule.
20	MR. KARREMAN: Well
21	MR. AZEVEDO: This is just something, you
22	know

1	MR. KARREMAN: Right. I wanted to ask,
2	though, what do you think about the work in progress
3	of what I had mentioned from the Livestock Committee
4	was it yesterday? about, you know, ruminant
5	animals over six months of age shall graze growing
6	pasture at least 120 days per year.
7	MR. AZEVEDO: Excellent. Excellent.
8	MR. KARREMAN: That's a positive
9	statement.
10	MR. AZEVEDO: Yes, but if
11	MR. KARREMAN: I mean, we can go even
12	MR. AZEVEDO: if somebody forgot to dot
13	the I, or the shall wasn't in the should, or do you
14	understand what I'm saying? If something goes awry,
15	we're set back another year and a half. Do you see
16	what I mean? We need something now that would that
17	would give us some kind of guidance that we can move
18	forward with all these farmers that want to get into
19	organic, and 99 percent of them are pure of heart.
20	They want to do it right.
21	But what you came up with, that's

that's beautiful.

MR. KARREMAN: Well, we'll try to work on 1 2 that. 3 CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: Okay. Well, thanks, Tony, and thanks for coming back. 4 5 All right. I have Diane Goodman, but then it says time given to Steve Clarke. Steve is going to 6 7 take it. And then, next up will be Michael McGuffin. MR. CLARKE: Good morning. 8 Steve Clarke 9 with Florida Crystals Corporation. This is going to be very brief. 10 11 This is my first NOSB meeting. It's been 12 interesting, and at the same time confusing and 13 illuminating, so I understand more. On behalf of 14 Florida Crystals, we agree very much with the mission We find it rather odd to be rebuked for 15 of NOSB. 16 suggesting another approach, some think because it's 17 not been done way before, especially in the issue of 18 the synthetic/non-synthetic confusion. On this matter, I think at least the OTA 19 20 decision tree should be incorporated in the documents 21 from the NOSB. It's clear to me that there's some 22 lack of chemical expertise on the Board. When a

cartoon guide to chemistry is proposed as a useful source of information, I wonder whether a cartoon guide to law or auditing should also be proposed.

It would probably be a conflict of interest for me to offer my services, but I have no doubt that good expertise is available.

Finally, and more seriously, there are many operations abroad that supply organic products to the USA. The major impact of these operations has been in the field. Many farmers in South/Central America have gone over to organic, and this is wonderful.

But the confusion in the classification of synthetic/non-synthetic could, in a minor processing aid -- in the processing operations could jeopardize a large amount of this. And I think we need to bear in mind that what we are trying to do, from my perspective, is to change the way agriculture works. And this is being done in large part.

I was in an operation in Paraguay last week, which has a very large organic operation with many, many different farmers involved. But they are

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

concerned that they will not be able to continue in 1 2 operation if this synthetic/non-synthetic issue is not 3 resolved. 4 Thank you. 5 CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: Thanks, Steve. 6 MR. CLARKE: Okay. 7 Michael McGuffin, and CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: 8 next up Mark Cox. 9 MR. McGUFFIN: Good morning. My name is I'm with the American Herbal 10 Michael McGuffin. 11 Products Association, or AHPA. And I'm here today to 12 discuss exactly what I discussed last time I was here. 13 support in clarifying that need your 14 dietary supplements are clearly within the scope of the NOP. 15 I want to review first what NOP has said 16 17 on this matter to date. In the Federal Register of 18 December 2000, they said, "Producers and handlers of 19 agricultural products used as ingredients 20 cosmetics, body care products, and dietary supplements

ultimate labeling of cosmetics, body care products,

could be certified under these regulations.

21

and dietary supplements, however, is outside the scope of these regulations."

2002, they Then, in May reversed themselves, stated that because these products contain agricultural products, the producers and handlers of such products are eligible to seek certification. They reverted to their original position in April 2004, stating that dietary supplements are not eligible to seek certification. They gave two reasons.

These products are under the labeling and regulatory jurisdiction of FDA, and OFPA does not extend to non-agricultural products. And then, of course, the most recent statement from NOP, just to clarify everything, "Regarding dietary supplements, no determination has been made at this time concerning their labeling." Confused? Me, too. My members, too, and my members want to sell organic dietary supplements.

So I want to look at these two issues.

And, first, related to the fact that labeling and regulation and dietary supplements are under the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

jurisdiction of FDA, this is also true of foods.

Here's a can of soup. It's labeled according to FDA regulations. It's got these nutrient content claims. If you don't make them right, they'll seize your product. It says, "An excellent source of fiber." If it doesn't have 20 percent fiber, your product comes off the shelf, and it's got a USDA organic seal.

This company figured out how to have its product clearly under the jurisdiction of both FDA and USDA.

Now, here's a peppermint spirit sold as a dietary supplement, an herbal dietary supplement. There's nothing in here except extracted peppermint, certified organically grown, peppermint oil extracted from that same peppermint, and organic alcohol. Dietary supplement, can't put the word "organic" on it, can't put the USDA seal.

Peppermint flavor, a food, exactly the same ingredients. Actually, this one has alcohol, this one has a scent -- or sunflower oil I think it is, an organic vegetable oil. But there are organic

peppermint with an organic carrier, supporting organic agriculture. This one can be labeled as organic. This one can be -- cannot be under USDA's/NOP's restrictive reading -- the messages that we get every other time.

It's absolutely clear that the intention of OFPA is to allow both of these products, and it's a red herring to say that the fact that jurisdiction over the label somehow makes it. impossible for us. It's not unless the organic seal is to be relegated only to the produce department, which was not the intention of the Organic Foods Production Act.

With regard to this idea that this is not an agricultural commodity, which is the other point, you know, here is what OFPA says. I'm going to quote the definition of an agricultural product is "any agricultural product -- commodity or product, whether raw or processed, including commodity produced or derived from livestock, marketed in the United States for human or livestock consumption."

This is clearly an agricultural product.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

It's peppermint. It's extracted. It's processed.

And it is for human consumption. In fact, the law requires us -- we're not allowed to sell dietary supplements to rub on your arm. The only way we can consume dietary supplements is by oral ingestion.

Again, I just think these are both excuses to not get this done. I believe this is a simple matter. And if I had another five minutes, I would also discuss that our industry does support organic labeling of cosmetic products and body care products, but we've really tried to separate those issues, because this one is simple.

We are putting it in our mouths. There is no question as to whether this is consumed. I understand — is a body care product consumed? I can argue that it is. I'm not really here today to take on that issue.

I think this is a simple issue. It's not complicated like synthetic versus natural. It's just -- all I can ask you guys to do I think is to exert whatever influence you can to convince NOP to take the -- I think it's 30 minutes, maybe it's a half a day,

to issue a very clear rule that these are clearly allowed under NOP.

Thanks very much.

CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: Thanks, Michael.

Gerry?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. DAVIS: It seems to me that part of problem why diet you know, the herbal ___ supplements, their intermingling with supplements causes the problem for them $\circ f$ it possible to separate herbal jurisdiction. Is supplements to bring them under the organic program and to avoid -- I just wonder if that's the sticking point, because they're all lumped together with the minerals, which are not organic. They're not possible to call those organic.

MR. McGUFFIN: I'd love to respond. There are -- you're correct. There are four or five categories of ingredients. We would not propose that if this company wanted to sell peppermint spirits and a multivitamin, this would be the only one that they could market as organic, because this is the only one that's an agricultural product.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

So we're not proposing that the non-agricultural dietary supplements would come under. You know, clearly the first decision that would have to be made is, yes or no, is it an agricultural product? If it's from an herb, clearly it is. So you're right, it's the herbal dietary supplements that we're asking for.

But the fact that there are other dietary supplements should not complicate the route to the organic market for the herbal products.

Does that help, Gerald?

MR. DAVIS: Well, I guess my question is directed more to the Board on is -- is this the problem for solving their dilemma? Because we have in -- as a general category, they're all lumped together versus being distinctly separate -- you know, mineral supplements versus herbal supplements.

CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: Yes. Well, my response would be you're right on there, that it -- and so is Michael, that our focus can only be the agricultural products or the supplements and other herbal products that are derived from agricultural

ingredients.

As far as what the Board can do, I might ask the Policy Committee to take this under advisement as well as the comments we received Monday on the personal care products, and consider recommendation or further statement to the program at the very least.

MR. McGUFFIN: And we did in our -- as part of our last comments, we provided you with a markup, I think a redline, of your earlier draft on this issue. And I can redistribute that if it's at all helpful, because we think that we've got some pretty close language in that document that you are already working on, Dave.

CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: Any further -- yes, Hugh?

MR. KARREMAN: I know in the herbal tinctures and extracts I get from my herbal supplier for working with livestock he has been told by the FDA he needs to put on those -- like on the can there. So wouldn't even very small print -- couldn't you get that kind of information like is on the can onto that little tincture bottle? And then cross both --

1	MR. McGUFFIN: Yes.
2	MR. KARREMAN: bridge both things.
3	MR. McGUFFIN: Yes, right.
4	MR. KARREMAN: Okay. So
5	MR. McGUFFIN: And that's what my members
6	want to do.
7	MR. KARREMAN: Right.
8	MR. McGUFFIN: They want to put all of the
9	information required by FDA
LO	MR. KARREMAN: Right.
L1	MR. McGUFFIN: and the USDA
L2	MR. KARREMAN: Exactly. That's
L3	MR. McGUFFIN: Yes.
L4	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: Bea?
L5	MS. JAMES: I understand exactly what
L6	you're saying. But I I really think that even
L7	though you have two products there that both come from
L8	a plant source and agricultural source, one is used as
L9	a food ingredient, and the other one is used for
20	medicinal purposes. Products that are medicinal are
21	regulated by the FDA.
22	MR. McGUFFIN: Right, as are products that

1	are food regulated by the Food and Drug
2	Administration.
3	MS. JAMES: Right, right.
4	MR. McGUFFIN: And, in fact, if I make a
5	medicinal claim for this, it becomes a drug. It's
6	actually not medicinal. It's a supplement, which is
7	federally defined under foods. This is a food. Even
8	though it's a food supplement, it is federally defined
9	as a food and not as a drug.
10	MS. JAMES: That's under DSHEA.
11	MR. McGUFFIN: Under the Dietary
12	Supplement Health and Education Act. You need I
13	mean, I can get you a copy of that if it helps.
14	There's some additional
15	MS. JAMES: No. No, I understand what
16	you're saying.
17	MR. McGUFFIN: information.
18	MS. JAMES: I'm just
19	MR. McGUFFIN: The fact that you can make
20	a claim you're right, we can make a claim. So can
21	this SOOP. It made a claim. It's a different kind of
22	claim. Although we can we can pretty much make the

1	same claims anymore. They can make a we can both
2	make health claims. We're the only ones that can make
3	what's called a structure/function claim.
4	But we can't make a medicinal claim,
5	although I could argue that there's nothing that says
6	that a drug from organic herbs shouldn't be able to be
7	labeled as organic. But I'm not here to argue that
8	today. I'll come back. I'll come back
9	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: I'm glad to hear
10	that, Michael.
11	(Laughter.)
12	Thanks for your input
13	MR. McGUFFIN: Appreciate it.
14	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: and your patience
15	in coming back and working with us.
16	MR. McGUFFIN: Well, I know you guys have
17	a lot going on. My main point probably is I think
18	this one is simple. It's not weeks and months and
19	years, and we'd love to get it done. Thanks a lot.
20	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: Thank you. And we've
21	thought other things are simple before.
22	(Laughter.)

Simple for the NOSB is weeks 1 MR. CARTER: 2 and months and years. 3 (Laughter.) 4 CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: We have Mark -- Mark 5 Cox. Is Mark here? It says Mark. No? Okav. Neither one. Well, I'll call 6 Christine Cox? Okay. 7 their names again at the end. Is Urvashi Rangan here? Okay. 8 Take your 9 time, since I didn't give you any warning. 10 will be Mark Retzloff. Is Mark here? So if Mark is 11 not here, then Kathy Seus would be next, just to try 12 and give you some warning. 13 Okay. Urvashi, thanks. 14 Good morning. MS. RANGAN: Okay. I also 15 -- my name is Urvashi Rangan. I'm an 16 environmental health scientist with Consumers Union, 17 publisher of Consumer Reports. I want to thank this 18 Board for the painful efforts of getting through the synthetics document yesterday and the guidance. 19 20 Ι disagree with would some previous 21 I think you all have a lot of -- you've 22 spent a lot of time and effort in trying to understand Chemistry 101, and it is Chemistry 101. This isn't advanced doctoral chemistry. This is Chemistry 101, and it takes a little time to get familiar with the terms, but that's all that's really required to figure out the differences. So we really appreciate your time and your effort, and we strongly support your actions yesterday.

I'm going to talk today a little bit about looking forward, and I want to talk about labeling in general and a little bit about fish, because consumers are awfully confused out there. And while we appreciate the fact that the NOP has reconsidered how certain products are regulated in terms of do they have standards, don't they, do the standards fit under another category, don't they, and those things are perfectly legitimate in terms of fine-tuning this program and making sure that, you know, aquaculture really does need its own standards. It's not a cow. Fish are not cows.

And that we do need the time to create those standards, and we very much appreciate the fact that task forces have been set up to do that.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Unfortunately, there's an awful lot of organic fish product that's on the market right now. And while we talk about the USDA seal and surmise that that's the only thing consumers are looking for, that is not the only thing consumers are looking for.

They look at the front of the package, and if they see the word "organic" on it they assume it is as credible as other organic products that they are buying on the market. And it has been a very tedious task for us at Consumers Union to go through and constantly reexplain, no, organic fish that you're seeing on the market right now does not meet the same standards. It is not the same thing.

We really urge this Board and the NOP to reconsider whether or not that label should stay on organic fish right now while the standards are being made. It really does a disservice to consumers. It does a disservice to the industries that -- or the companies that are trying to do a good job and coming up with standards on their own.

Recently, we -- or I should say at the last meeting, I think last summer, the NOP stated to

NEAL R. GROSS

us that no USDA seal would be found on an organic fish product. And yet a couple of months ago it came to our attention that certain companies were using the USDA organic seal on their fish and claiming to be the first USDA-certified company to be certified to livestock standards.

That was such in contradiction to what we were told at the last meeting, so Consumers Union called the Public Affairs Office at USDA and asked repeatedly and reexplained and sent the news stories, and we never got an adequate answer about why this was being allowed and whether it was going to be stopped.

told we would hear from the were Compliance Office. did hear We never from the Compliance Office. Who we heard from was a reporter from Business Week Television who took this up, went to the USDA, interviewed them, and then finally we told by that reporter that USDA told these companies to stop doing it.

And yet up until just yesterday there are materials on the website that say these companies are certified to USDA livestock standards. This is

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

	awruriy confusing, and we rearry would appreciate it
2	if we could just ban the use of the organic label on
3	these fish and seafood products until the standards
4	are created.
5	And I very much urge those of you who are
6	on the agriculture task forces to please strongly
7	consider that as one of your main missions, and please
8	to consider contaminant issues like mercury and PCBs.
9	We do not want consumers in California, for example,
10	who will see a Prop-65 label indicating that there's a
11	carcinogen in their fish to also have an organic label
12	slapped on top of that. Consumers will not be able to
13	make sense of what that means.
14	Thank you.
15	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: Thanks, Urvashi.
16	Okay. Is Mark Kastel I mean, not Mark
17	Kastel, Mark Retzloff
18	(Laughter.)
19	It's like confusing Arthur
20	(Laughter.)
21	Okay. I don't see Mark Retzloff in the
22	audience. So Kathy Seus, and then Joe Mendelson.

MS. SEUS: My name is Kathy Seus. I'm here on behalf of Food Animal Concerns Trust, FACT, in Chicago, Illinois. I just want to give a little bit of background on how I got involved in this whole organic process. My first NOSB meeting was the Chicago meeting a couple of years ago. And for anyone that attended that meeting, I think we would all agree that it was lively, to say the least.

And it became fairly apparent during that meeting that there was truly a lack of cooperation and collaboration between the NOP and the NOSB. In the past couple of years, it does seem like we've sort of taken a step forward, that in some respects there has been a little bit more cooperation.

However, what happened on Monday with the rejection -- the way the rejection of the pasture suggestions were handled, sort of felt like two steps back. That said, I'm going to acknowledge Chairman Riddle's comments earlier today that he does feel that there's a spirit of cooperation, a collaboration, that's -- you know, the precedent is being set today. I'd just like to say -- I mean, I'm going to put the

past behind and let's say let's just move forward on that, and let's keep that going.

We'd like to see these regulation changes on pasture move forward. I'm asking that the NOP and the NOSB continue this precedent that's been set of collaboration and cooperation and move forward on this thing. I think it's possible, and I'm going to sort of take a positive spin on this and -- and say that that happens, and it happens quickly.

I didn't say this earlier, I apologize. I also have a proxy from Kathie Arnold, and I'd like to read her comments.

"I do want to express my disappointment that the pasture rule changes have been sent back to the NOSB. I retain optimism that this is truly due to something lacking rather than due to pressure applied to the NOP by commercial and/or political interests. I retain hope that the NOP has or will clearly articulate to the Livestock Committee what specifics were missing in these NOSB-approved rule changes, that continues expeditiously the process as possible.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

"Thanks to the Livestock Committee for working on modifications already. And I encourage posting of a draft rule change as soon as possible to allow public comment, to enable a vote at the fall NOSB meeting, if it happens.

"Great thanks to the NOSB for passing the pasture guidance document yesterday. I appreciate all the hard work involved, and the willingness to incorporate public comment. I ask that the NOP accept and post this guidance document as soon as possible."

That's it.

CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: Thanks, Kathy. And just to clarify once again that the NOP did not reject our pasture rule change recommendation. They referred it back to us for further work. There's a significant difference in the two. And referring back to us is part of a collaboration. They need something that really works for them, and that can be enforceable and can move forward in the rule-writing process with sufficient justification.

So please have patience, and we all just need to stay focused on that.

Any other -- okay. Moving on, we have Joe Mendelson, and next up Liana Hoodes.

MR. MENDELSON: Good morning. I'm Joe Mendelson. I'm the Legal Director for the Center for Food Safety. I want to thank the Board and the program for all their hard work over the last several days.

Two brief comments. The first is more of a response to some comments that were made earlier in the week, and that to paraphrase those comments that the goal of the Board and the program should be to — an almost undue speed in — in a promotion sense you get to a point of 20 percent acreage for organic production, and we shall be striving to that, and that's the main goal.

And certainly the Center for Food Safety wants to see as much acreage as possible under organic production. But I just want to remind the Board and others that the goal, and specifically the legislative history of the Board, is to set standards, and to make sure when we get to 20 percent there's a road map on how to get there.

You know, percentage of acreage doesn't mean anything if the standards don't mean anything. And to suggest that folks in certain communities who are trying to make sure that the standards maintain what they feel their constituents -- consumers and environmental advocates -- have substance that those constituencies want to see doesn't mean we're trying to hinder in any way the expansion of organic.

On the contrary, we want to make sure that organic expands, but it also means something because that's the goal is to have organic mean something.

The second is to follow up on the comments of Urvashi Rangan from Consumers Union on the enforcement issue. I believe I commented a couple of Board meetings ago, and still am working on a paper I promised the Board, but we do have this -- this issue of enforcement that I don't think is resolved.

I mean, there was some suggestion this week that folks dealing with personal care products, while I'm not making any comment on whether they should be within the program or not -- and I certainly sympathize with some of the folks who had earlier

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

testimony on that -- but the idea was that if the personal care products aren't under the scope of the program, they can still go to an organic certifier to get certified, they just can't have the USDA seal.

And I think we -- if that's the road we want to go down, that folks can use the term "organic" without representation or without standards through this process for agricultural products. We're creating a two-tiered system. And as Urvashi mentioned, it is happening in fish, and it would happen in -- in personal care products.

And that is that people are out claiming that they're organic, implying that they meet USDA standards, whether they use the USDA seal or not, when, in fact, both the program and this Board have not made substantive findings as to what those standards are.

And it's very clear that the -- the law, 6519(a), says, "Any person who knowingly sells or labels a product as organic, not with a USDA seal, except in accordance with this chapter, shall be subject to civil penalties not more than \$10,000."

I don't think we want to endorse or create a system by which people are out there using the term "organic" when we don't have substantive standards. And that term, as Urvashi mentioned, does imply, whether the seal or not, to consumers that it's meeting some type of USDA endorsement.

That may be very unfortunate to people who, if the program and the Board decide that personal care is not within the scope -- and I can sympathize with that -- but the fact of the matter is to -- to have -- the solution isn't to have product out there labeled organic, and have consumers misled on -- on -- and I would hope we would try and come to some resolution.

I don't think we're -- we've really gotten
-- we've talked about scope, but we don't talk about
how the program is enforcing. And I don't think
enforcement of just pulling the seal is enough. I
think it's the term "organic" that really is the heart
of the matter.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: Thanks, Joe.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	Okay. Liana Hoodes, and Lisa Hummon.
2	MS. HOODES: Good morning. I'm Liana
3	Hoodes. I'm going to read comments verbatim from
4	Michael Sligh.
5	MS. CAUGHLAN: Do you have a proxy? I
6	mean, are you taking five and five?
7	MS. HOODES: No.
8	MS. CAUGHLAN: That's fine.
9	MS. HOODES: No. Michael Sligh is "I
10	am Michael Sligh"
11	(Laughter.)
12	"founding Chair of this Board, Co-Chair
13	of the National Campaign for Sustainable Agriculture
14	Organic Committee, and Policy Director for Rural
15	Advancement Foundation International USA.
16	"Please let me start by thanking all of
17	you for your perseverance and continued dedication to
18	the advancement of organic agriculture. We may not
19	always agree on everything, but the fact that we are
20	all still here speaks volumes of our shared
21	commitment.
22	"I send special thanks to the upcoming

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

NOSB retirees. I know well of your sacrifice, and welcome and many thanks to the new Board members for your willingness to answer the call to serve organic agriculture. I look forward to getting to know each of you better.

"I wish to use my time to strongly support several key points. First, I strongly support the inclusion of biodiversity language into the guidance template for certifiers. This is an essential element of organic agriculture and should be much more strongly visible in our verification documents.

"On a related point concerning how strong
-- how to strongly require organic seeds, I again
remind the Board that since this program has a global
reach, and especially because of this, it can have
unintended impacts on program participants in the
global centers of biodiversity.

"We must be very aware that forcing this requirement too quickly, or so strictly, will have extremely negative impacts on local seed biodiversity and farmer choices. Locally-adapted varieties, which have been proven winners over the centuries, must

always be supported over imported seeds, organic or not, which can have a narrower genetic base, be an inappropriate variety, and/or be of unproven local adaptability.

"I caution you about this and offer support in the development of appropriate steps to support the growth of organic seeds without undermining already vulnerable locally-adapted seed biodiversity.

"Secondly, I am very disappointed that the very solid work by family-sized organic dairy farmers to clarify the pasture guidance requirements has been delayed. A lack of greater specificity is critically needed to guide certifiers to make consistent decisions and to avoid loss of consumer confidence, not to mention ensuring the welfare and natural behavioral needs of the animals.

"However, we cannot have it both ways. We have asked, and the Inspector General of USDA has required, the NOP to demonstrate cooperation with the NOSB and to provide responses to the many previously unanswered NOSB recommendations. They have actually

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

responded to this issue.

"To expedite this critical issue, we need to request that NOP/USDA response be much more specific and that it be put in writing if further delayed. My suggestion is for you and the NOP to roll up your sleeves and fix this matter at this meeting. Failing this, I strongly urge an additional meeting before the end of this year, and for the meeting to be held out in the dairy country to facilitate greater farmer access to this timely matter.

"Please do not leave this matter hanging.

It has very large implications. Some additional specifics are better than the current void.

"Finally, I rise to make critical comments regarding the sunset provisions. It is very important that NOSB exercise your full statutory responsibilities. You were very consciously awarded these responsibilities as a duly-appointed citizen board. Your actions should be consistent with and provide solid continuity from past NOSB decisions. It must also be rigorous and fully transparent.

"When the founding Board voted on the

original list of materials prior to the organic rule, we based our vote on several very important caveats. One, the sunset process meant that all materials were required to be rereviewed within the five-year requirements. Many of the votes were very close, controversial, and lacked clear consensus. Many of the materials would not be on the list at all if this caveat had not been clearly understood.

"Two, in fact, we also understood that if the material was not rereviewed within this timeframe it automatically went off the list. This is very important.

"Three, synthetics in processed foods labeled as organic were clearly understood by many on the NOSB to be not allowed by OFPA. We remanded USDA that they must be resolved in the rulemaking process, or that those materials voted as allowed synthetics for processed foods would be in violation of OFPA. Our votes were made based on that understanding.

"Four, many materials votes required additional caveats, such as accelerated reviewed, annotations, and narrow use requirements, to win Board

1	support, <u>et</u> <u>al.</u> , especially regarding the use of
2	synthetics in processed foods. It is incumbent upon
3	this Board to ensure that the sunset process adhere to
4	the legislative intent, the law, honors the original
5	caveats, and does not set expedient precedents that
6	will allow for unwarranted discretion and special
7	interests to hold sway over organic integrity.
8	"Please feel free to contact me if I can
9	be of additional help, clarification, or support. And
10	thank you for your for this opportunity and for
11	your continued dedication to organic."
12	Thanks.
13	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: Thanks, Liana and
14	Michael. Oh, a question?
15	MR. DAVIS: Concerning Michael's comments,
16	there was a lot of meat there that how do I get a
17	copy of that, for example?
18	MS. HOODES: I actually have one copy, and
19	I can probably make more here, too, so
20	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: If you could make
21	more to distribute, that would be great. And make
22	sure that Katherine has a copy as well.

1	MS. HOODES: Okay. Very good.
2	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: All right. Thanks
3	Gerry.
4	Okay. It's Lisa Hummon, and then Brian
5	Baker.
6	MS. HUMMON: Good morning. I'm Lisa
7	Hummon with Defenders of Wildlife. And that's spelled
8	H-U-M-M-O-N.
9	Defenders of Wildlife is a national
LO	501(c)(3) nonprofit conservation organization with
L1	over 490,000 members dedicated to the protection of
L2	native wild animals and plants in their natural
L3	communities. Defenders has been actively involved in
L4	supporting and strengthening sustainable agriculture
L5	and conservation working landscapes for more than 20
L6	years.
L7	We would like to thank the Board for
L8	passing the biodiversity amendments to the organic
L9	system plan. We helped provide input in the
20	development of the amendments, and we would like to
21	thank the Wild Farm Alliance and ATTRA for their

leadership.

We believe that working lands can and are doing much to conserve biodiversity. With 40 percent of plant and animal species listed as threatened or endangered, found only on private and state lands, as well as 60 percent of at-risk species, it is extremely important that we continue to encourage biodiversity conservation and agricultural landscapes.

eliminating of By the use harmful pesticides and promoting ecologically sound practices, organic for agriculture has great benefits biodiversity and at-risk species. And by adopting these biodiversity amendments to the organic system plan, the organic label will clearly define what it means to conserve biodiversity on an organic farm or ranch, as well as the surrounding landscape.

By rewarding these ecologically beneficial practices, the organic program will further implement the goals of fish and wildlife and habitat conservation, sustaining rural communities and providing a trusted label for consumers.

We encourage the NOSB and the NOP to implement this revised OSP by providing it to

NEAL R. GROSS REPORTERS AND TRANSCR

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

certifying agencies, putting it on appropriate websites, and any other means you can find possible.

And Defenders will do what we can to get the word out about these as well.

We would also like to thank the Board for

approving the guidance for organic pasture requirements. This is a good step in the right direction to ensure that consumers have confidence that the organic milk and other products that they buy have been produced in an environmentally sustainable manner, and that farmers who are using these good practices and being good stewards of the land are rewarded properly and fairly in the marketplace.

This will also help protect the food systems that provide health and nutrition benefits to humans and ecological benefits to wildlife.

We encourage the NOSB and the NOP to continue to work together to revise the proposed rule change, post it for public comment, and bring it to a vote at the next NOSB meeting.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: Thanks, Lisa.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	Brian Baker, and then Joe Smillie.
2	MR. BAKER: Brian Baker, Research
3	Director, Organic Materials Review Institute. And I'd
4	like to start by recognizing and honoring your
5	practical expertise and your experience and all of the
6	work that you've done.
7	I really also want to specifically thank
8	you for passing the synthetic/non-synthetic
9	clarification recommendation. And I think that having
10	this clear guidance will help us move ahead with our
11	mission to independently and transparently review
12	inputs for use in organic production and processing
13	and handling.
14	When I came in the room yesterday while
15	you were discussing it I apologize, I was out of
16	the room, I came in late, and I sat down next to Pat
17	Kane and I asked her how long the discussion was going
18	on. She said about 20 years.
19	(Laugher.)
20	But, really, it's been more it's been
21	over 30. Our we've been dealing with this question
22	of synthetic and non-synthetic since the passage of

the California Organic Foods Act in 1979, or the first Rodale standards in 1972. It's not like we just came up with this yesterday.

And we've been grappling with these issues. They're difficult. But I think it's not rocket science, and, you know, it's -- it is -- there are some pretty fundamental guideposts that we have.

We're also not arguing about the vast majority of things out there. The vast majority of inputs used in agriculture and in processing are prohibited. There's no question about that. There are only a few things that are allowed in organic, and it's those gray areas where we're having all of the discussion, really.

So we've had experts on the NOSB and on the Technical Advisory Panel look this over, and, you know, reasonable people can disagree. But the disagreements, if you look at the record, are very few. And, you know, yes, they're contentious, they're passionately argued, but we're really only talking about few things where have deep-seated we disagreements.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

OMRI wants to work with all parties and the public, with the NOP and the NOSB, to help bring about an understanding, and to have a dialogue on these -- on these issues where we have -- have worked with decisionmaking, looking at different formulations, different mixes, and we realize that synthetic reactions don't always take place when you put a bunch of things in a bottle and shake it up.

But sometimes they do, and, you know, these side reactions do occur, you know, and to understand, you know, these -- these reactions run downhill, you know, and there are certain conditions where they'll take place, certain conditions where they won't. We need to have -- we need to look at that and have a better understanding.

The other thing is that all substances are Everything out there is used for a purpose. active. few exceptions that are in are а statutes, such as EPA registered pesticides and FDA registered animal drugs. Those are specific exceptions. But everything put in a fertilizer bag, or everything put in a vitamin pack, is in there for a

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

reason.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

So at the end of the day, you know, organic is a labeling law. And, you know, it's looking at the different ingredients that are on the bag or on the box, and I want to throw in as far as scope goes, also don't forget fertilizer and the way fertilizer inputs are labeled.

But, you know, it's our take that if it's on the -- if it's on the bag label, and it's synthetic, and it's not on the national list, it's not allowed. And I'd like to have, you know, clarity on that, because that's not -- if that's not going to be followed, that's a huge change from what we've been doing for the past 30 years or so.

And one minute left, I'd like to switch to the other thing I'd like to talk about. about pathogens on Monday. I'd like to talk about another contaminant, and that's heavy metals. And, you know, we've been -- we also published a study on heavy metals found in organic inputs, and we are suggesting -- we are hoping that the NOSB will work clarify what with the NOP to it means not

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	contribute to the contamination of crops, livestock
2	crops, soil, and water, with heavy metals.
3	And we're looking at a no net degradation
4	standard. We believe that this is the most protective
5	and precautionary way to to deal with it. We also
6	recognize that arsenic and lead are on the prohibited
7	non-synthetics list, and we'd like to know what
8	thresholds of arsenic and lead are acceptable.
9	Is that time?
10	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: That is time.
11	MR. BAKER: Okay.
12	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: And I think you
13	actually finished your there's a question. Go
14	ahead. I'm sorry. Yes. I had looked there first,
15	but
16	PARTICIPANT: A blind spot.
17	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: Yes, right.
18	MS. OSTIGUY: Brian, the Crops Committee
19	is looking at contaminants in fertilizer specifically
20	at the moment. Could I get a copy of that report? Is
21	it done?
22	MR. BAKER: Yes, you can. I don't have it

1	with me. It is on our website.
2	MS. OSTIGUY: Okay.
3	MR. BAKER: It's on the Advisory Council
4	section. I can send you the link, or I can send
5	you
6	MS. OSTIGUY: That would be great.
7	MR. BAKER: a hard copy.
8	MS. OSTIGUY: Just send me a link. That
9	would be great.
10	MR. BAKER: Okay.
11	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: Gerry?
12	MR. DAVIS: Is George still next or
13	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: No, he was just
14	getting my attention.
15	MR. DAVIS: A comment about no net
16	degradation principle for heavy metals in the
17	environment, and so forth. Elaborate on that a little
18	bit, please.
19	MR. BAKER: Well, you don't want the
20	levels to trend up over time. So a no net degradation
21	would mean if we've got, say, 10 parts per million of
22	arsenic in the soil today, we want it to be no more

1	than 10 parts per million, you know, 10 years, 20
2	years, 100 years from now. And if we have if it
3	goes from 10 to 20, we have degradation.
4	MR. DAVIS: So that would be going from
5	10 to 20 would be based on a site-specific level, or
6	are you talking about an average for the country or
7	MR. BAKER: That's a very good point, and
8	I would the suggestion is to make it an average for
9	the country, a national average, because what you have
10	if you make it site-specific is that the more polluted
11	areas receive more pollutants. The less polluted
12	areas receive less pollutants. And if you make it a
13	national average, then it averages out.
14	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: I have a comment, and
15	then back to Nancy. I really appreciate you bringing
16	this up, and it's been on my mind as well. And I see
17	that it relates to the whole term used in the
18	regulation, and even defined, of unavoidable residual
19	environmental contaminants, or UREC.
20	And in the preamble it discusses that the
21	Secretary will be establishing UREC levels. And to my
22	knowledge, the Board and the program has not taken

this up, and, you know, I -- there certainly are other priorities to be working on, but we can't ignore this one forever.

So I truly appreciate your bringing it up and providing some further information to the Board to consider.

Nancy?

MS. OSTIGUY: The national level, standard, whatever, would make -- I can see the logic of that. How would we deal, though, or has OMRI thought about how we would deal with materials or substances like selenium, which have very widely different levels in the country?

MR. BAKER: That's a good question, and I would suggest, you know, to echo what Jim says, I know that you have many things to deal with. And to make it tractable, to make it possible to deal with, I would suggest you prioritize certain metals starting with, of course, arsenic and lead, because they are on the prohibited national list, and they're referred to in the statute.

But then, also looking at -- I would

NEAL R. GROSS

suggest that the next priority after that be cadmium, 1 2 because it appears in so many different amendments 3 in organic production, because its and 4 mobility and toxicity. 5 CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: Thanks, Brian. MR. BAKER: Thank you. 6 7 CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: Okay. We have Joe Smillie, and then Leslie Zuck. And before you start, 8 9 Joe, if I could have someone check the list, sign-up 10 list, see if there are any additional names, because 11 we're getting down to the end. I want to make sure 12 everybody gets their chance. 13 All right. Thanks, Joe. 14 MR. SMILLIE: Joe Smillie, that's S-M-I-L-I work for Quality Assurance International, 15 L-I-E. 16 and I'd like to speak today on behalf of that agency 17 and also as an organic consumer. 18 Thank you for having this meeting. 19

Thank you for having this meeting. Thank you for allowing everyone to speak. As a certification agent, we deal with the issues that you're talking about every day. We have a policy meeting every Tuesday morning that lasts for two

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

20

21

hours.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

We call our group Deep Gray, and we deal with this stuff all the it's time, so really refreshing to come here and hear fellow colleagues deal with the same issues, because they're tricky. And as Brian pointed out, we have general agreement on It's the middle ones most things. that we have trouble with.

I'd specifically like to thank the NOSB from the bottom of my heart for clarifying and coming recommendation back with new on listing of certification agents on packaged product. That was The report last time we asked you really disturbing. to reconsider it. You did. You came up with what I think is an excellent recommendation, and hopefully the NOP, it sounds like, will adopt parts of it.

I've heard Barbara specifically talk about voluntary certification and the recognition of voluntary certification for retailers who accept the certification as a final handler. And that's very important, and Ι look forward seeing to that enshrined.

The issue about mandatory certification for retailers or others who go the private label route is complicated. And as you've discovered yourself, where do you draw the line between just having something made for you, and then also -- we also have clients who have co-packers, but basically they're running that co-packing facility.

I mean, they're filling out the application forms, the organic compliance plan, the specifications, ordering the agreements — you know, they should be certified. But it's a tricky issue and one which I know that you'll deal with, and it will take some time to figure out where you would stand on mandatory certification of companies that commission private labels but are really much more involved in it. I look forward to that dialogue and hope to participate in it.

the second issue, it's mix of а personal and professional concerns, and that's whole idea of the yeast issue, which talks about a lot living organisms. Ι especially liked the I loved Dave's very simple analysis -conversation.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

living and non-living. I know it has its limitations, 1 2 but I like it. 3 loved Goldie's supportive culture, because we're talking about cultures that can 4 5 handed down from generation to generation that are 6 cared and nurtured for in the -- and are truly 7 organic. I think Andrea's point on the regulatory 8 9 that nothing forbids it, if you can come up with an organic compliance plan to justify the raising and 10 11 culturing of these wonderful cultures, and that's a 12 reasonable compliance plan, I think you'll see a great 13 difference between the way conventional bacteria are 14 produced and others. 15 And with the GMO threat to enzymes and 16 that, I think we'd better start looking at organic 17 culture of cultures. 18 On a personal note, I eat large amounts of 19 miso, tempe, shoyu, and tamari. And these were --20 some of these products were some of the original

organic products in the organic industry, and it would

just be more than a crying shame -- I can live with an

21

1	organic Twinkie, but I can't live without organic
2	shoyu and miso. And I would hate to see those
3	products eliminated because of a strict, rigorous,
4	scientific interpretation about Koji cultures.
5	I've been to koji is, and I'm getting
6	my, you know, cartoon book of Guide to Chemistry for
7	sure, but aspergillus oryzae or, no, ryzobis
8	ryzobis no, ryzobis is tempe, aspergillus oryzae
9	is miso and shoyu and that. And I visited some of
10	these cultures, and let me tell you, it's an
11	agricultural culture.
12	I mean, the way that koji is raised is
13	phenomenal, and you just need to go to South River
14	Miso in Conway, Massachusetts, if you want to see
15	organic culture raising. It's fabulous.
16	On that issue, you know, don't take away
17	my miso and shoyu
18	(Laughter.)
19	as organic. It really will get ugly,
20	then, and betray my last name.
21	On the third issue, I really support
22	and I thought Michael McGuffin really laid it out very

clearly for you. I think it's just really obvious, and I think we just need to deal with it. I don't think that's a complicated issue, as I carefully pointed out myself.

And I think we need, as a certification agent -- you know, we're tied. Joe Mendelson made some comments about having, you know, certifier seal up there without the USDA rule. And that's a problem for us, because when you get down to the logistics of what certificate do we issue, yes, there's no USDA seal, but what certificate do we, as an ACA, cut for a product that we clearly see as organic, we clearly see their right do it, but to we've got this jurisdictional issue.

So let -- I think that's solvable, and I think if we applied political pressure and allow the NOP to make the right decision, I think that's the route we should take on that.

So, once again, I thank the NOP for their great work, you for your great work, and I really enjoy these meetings. Some people find them tedious and boring, but for those of us who live every day in

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

these issues it's just fun to see other people have to suffer the same fate.

(Laughter.)

Thanks.

CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: Thanks, Joe, and it's good to see you here.

Leslie Zuck, and then Marty Mesh.

MS. ZUCK: Good morning. I'm Leslie Zuck, Executive Director of Pennsylvania Certified Organic. In regard to the Board's recommendation on commercial availability of seed, I would like to say that we have farmers who often ask us if they -- "Do I have to purchase organic seed? I've never heard of this supplier before. They may be in California or New Mexico, and I'm used to buying my seed from my local dealer." And they really are reluctant.

It may be a vegetable grower who really needs to meet their customer satisfaction and demands for the quality of their vegetables, or it could just be an organic dairy farmer that doesn't want to risk their entire corn crop to some unknown variety of seed.

So we -- we tell them, you know, that -- I mean, these are also farmers who are very dedicated to organic, and they do want to do what the right thing is to do. They're not trying to wiggle out of it, but they've got -- their farm is their main -- their main concern.

So we tell them they have to make a good faith effort to use the organic seed, and in this case that they should try some of the seed, get some of it, try it, see how it works for them, see how they like it, and that's what it really boils down to. If the farmer likes it and it works for them, and it works for their customers, they're going to grow it.

And, you know, I've seen this happen. You know, I have to say, I would be a bit embarrassed to have to tell the farmer, "Well, you know, you could try some, but you've got to use scientific methods and replicated trials." I mean, the farmer doesn't know how to do that, and I don't know how to do that. So that's -- that's the one issue I have.

And some farmers have actually done these trials and have been disappointed in the quality of

NEAL R. GROSS

the organic seed. On the other hand, many produce growers, particularly tomato growers of heirloom tomatoes, have been happy to be able to switch to organic seed because of the more availability of the quality seed.

Personally, I had an entire year of -total crop failure the first year I purchased all
organic potato seed, and I wouldn't buy those spuds
again, scientific methods or not.

PCO also does not have a database or a list of the non-organic seeds that our clients are growing on hundreds of farms in Pennsylvania. So the reporting requirement would impose an additional paperwork burden on the farmers as well as this particular certifier to come up with that list.

I'm just really reluctant to impose more paperwork burdens on my clients without, you know, some strong justification that I can say that this information and data is useful somehow. And I guess I'm not feeling that way at this point, that the information will be used for something that would be useful for the industry.

Regarding the labeling of organic products by non-certified retailers -- different subject, sorry The retailer's exemption -- this is a major problem. intended stores from was to exempt grocery certification, allowing them to buy and resell organic be products in their stores without having to certified.

However, the problem is once a retailer starts putting its own products out there in the huge supermarket stream of commerce, it should be required to submit to the same organic certification requirements that, you know, other brand owners who have identical organic products that are competing with these store brands have to — have to submit to.

You know, I'm also extremely uncomfortable with having the PCO seal and the USDA seal on millions of packages sold by a company that PCO does not certify. **PCO** is responsible for the organic certification of those products, yet does not have the right to inspect the premises or the records of the that's selling them to the customers consumers, nor does the company have -- that company

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

doesn't have to submit sales records to us, it doesn't have to pay certification fees, it gives them an unfair marketing advantage over identical products branded by certified entities, you know, which in most cases the store also sells those products and is making a profit on them as well.

So I feel like if they want the benefits of certification, and they want to use the USDA seal, that the retail operation should have to pay the price and submit an organic system plan and be inspected.

We've already run into problems with this following up on consumer complaints about products carrying the PCO seal, but branded by a company we don't certify. We also have a situation where our client's label, complete with the PCO seal, was being placed by a retailer on a product our client did not produce.

This product was then distributed throughout the east coast, and to this day I don't know if it was organic. But that's been resolved.

I support the recommendation that labeling products with store brand -- with the store brand

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	becomes processing and requires the store to obtain
2	certification for that product. Not necessarily the
3	entire store would have to be certified, but the
4	production of that product should have to be
5	certified, and I hope that this issue can resolve
6	be resolved within the constraints of OFPA.
7	And one last thing two sentences
8	honey standards are desperately needed. Organic honey
9	is being marketed in the U.S., accompanied by
10	certificates issued by USDA-accredited certifiers,
11	which state that the honey complies with the NOP
12	standards. And it's difficult for me to explain to
13	potential clients why we can't certify honey producers
14	when their competitors in foreign countries are being
15	certified.
16	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: Okay. Yes, Hugh,
17	then George.
18	MR. KARREMAN: Leslie, how is it that, if
19	I understood you right, some of these some products
20	are out there with the PCO label if you didn't give

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

MS. ZUCK: Good question. Originally, the

it? How is that?

21

1	retailer was had a private label agreement with one
2	of our clients, and had a label produced for that
3	client and packaged the products were packaged and
4	put in the stream of commerce. Our client was
5	certified private label, no problem.
6	But then they ended their agreement, and
7	the store found another supplier of the product, and
8	used the labels and put it on the other product
9	produced by another place.
10	MR. KARREMAN: So they had spare labels.
11	MS. ZUCK: They didn't. They actually
12	from what I understand, they actually went and had
13	them xerox copied and made the same way that the old
14	ones were.
15	MR. KARREMAN: That would sound illegal,
16	but I don't know what the statutes say on that.
17	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: Are they also using
18	the USDA seal?
19	MS. ZUCK: Oh, yes. The seal was the
20	seal was
21	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: So both your seal and
22	USDA.

1	MS. ZUCK: The label was identical to the
2	one we approved. It went through the certification
3	process, was approved by the certifier, had our
4	certification on it, and they didn't think they were
5	doing anything wrong. It was not I don't believe
6	it was intentional.
7	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: We have George and
8	then Gerry.
9	MR. SIEMON: But that's this is fraud.
10	You know
11	(Laughter.)
12	please don't confuse policy with fraud.
13	Please. Okay?
14	MS. ZUCK: They really I think it was
15	totally an honest mistake. Sorry.
16	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: Okay. George,
17	continue.
18	MR. SIEMON: You first said that there's
19	places you did certify, and where you certified the
20	plant, you certified the processing, you certified the
21	ingredients. It's got your seal on it. You said that
22	you still felt uncomfortable that the retailer was

selling that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

I don't understand that. You're responsible -- your seal -- for the integrity of that product when it's sealed. Why do you care what the certifier and private label -- I mean, the retailer's -- there's no difference between that or a brand and once it leaves the plant.

Why is it a concern to you about their certification when you're responsible for putting it in the container and sealing it? So I'm confused with what you said earlier. You said you were -- that it wasn't right. I disagree.

MS. ZUCK: Well, I --

MR. SIEMON: Or I didn't understand your point.

MS. ZUCK: It makes it really difficult for the certifier to follow up on any consumer complaints about product that they purchased а We can't -- the situation that I just somewhere. talked about would not have occurred had we been, you know, inspecting and looking at the records, and that the retailer, as a certified entity, would understand what's required of them, what's not allowed to be done, what is required as far as labeling, would not have occurred had we certified that plant.

We had to spend a lot of time and effort following this complaint. Ιt very up on was difficult. It happened in a state -- you know, five states away, you know, somewhere else, that has our name on it. So we're required to follow up complaints by you know, according to our accreditation requirements, and, you know --

MR. SIEMON: But that seal was wrongly applied. It was fraudulent behavior. You know, you're always going to -- fraudulent is going to cause a lot of trouble for all of us to follow up on the research.

CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: I have a comment, and then we'll go to Gerry and Hugh. And that is in response to your questions about value of seed lists. Well, first, I'd just, you know, like to point out as you well know that records are mandatory to demonstrate compliance and to record transactions, and that's inputs as well as sales.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

And so, you know, and certainly something like records of seed purchases do need to be recorded by the operator and reviewed by the inspector. So it's not like the information does not exist. It should exist to comply with the regulation to begin with, but you -- yes, it's true that this would be an additional collection, and then submission of that information that already exists.

And why is that valuable? I guess to a certifier, if you do have a database where that's feeding in from different inspectors and different reviewers, you have a better tool for compliance between all of the operations you certify to make sure you're making consistent decisions, you know, and so that one operator isn't telling one inspector a certain story when those seeds are clearly available in an organic form, even in that variety.

So it can help with -- you know, with your own enforcement, but then also to bring consistency between certifiers in the accreditation process, so that you're on a level playing field with all other certifiers. So those coming into NOP certainly could

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

help bring consistency with that enforcement.

And then, finally, having that information come in in a generic form, not lists of names of the companies or the operators, but just the varieties, can certainly help advance the whole development of organic seeds and the availability, so that operators can better comply with the organic seed requirements. And maybe that wasn't spelled out clearly in our discussion yesterday.

MS. ZUCK: Yes. Generally and philosophically, I see that, but I guess my concern was all this data going to someplace and, you know, being collected but not necessarily being available for any useful purpose. I mean, I don't want to just send it and then have it be --

CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: And for now, we've made our recommendation. I'm sure we'll hear back about it. And, once again, it's not the end, it's just the beginning of the story.

MS. ZUCK: Our clients do keep, you know, records. Those records are kept at the farm, and inspectors do review them. We just don't collect them

1	at the office.
2	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: Right. I understand.
3	Gerry, did you still
4	MR. DAVIS: You covered most of it, Jim.
5	On the organic seed, the main thing is that I want
6	to express to Leslie is that we're trying to make some
7	progress toward further development of the organic
8	seed industry, which several commenters have pointed
9	out to us that it's stagnant, there's not progress
10	being made towards fulfilling the requirements of
11	growers using organic seed that's available, and the
12	market is not developing to make that seed available
13	because of the way we do things right now. And so
14	we're stuck, and that's the
15	MS. ZUCK: Ultimately, it will benefit the
16	farmers to have more availability of organic seed, but
17	I think there may be other ways to do it.
18	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: Any other - Hugh, and
19	then Bea.
20	MS. ZUCK: Surveys.
21	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: Okay. You had
22	hold my chain here.

1	MS. ZUCK: I think the USDA should have a
2	send a survey to farmers or some other way to do
3	it, or seed production companies, you know, some it
4	doesn't really need to be the purpose of this Board or
5	this or the farmers to come up with that.
6	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: No. But compliance
7	with the existing regulations certainly is
8	MS. ZUCK: Yes, we can
9	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: fair game. Hugh?
10	MR. KARREMAN: You mentioned about the
11	honey coming in from wherever it is, and that,
12	again
13	MS. ZUCK: Foreign countries.
14	MR. KARREMAN: it's a labeling issue.
15	But your what is it you have to put on your
16	seal? Or they're coming in with USDA approval and
17	MS. ZUCK: Well, if a client yes. If a
18	client has a product that contains honey, then we
19	review that product and we determine that every
20	ingredient in that product has a certificate
21	accompanying it stating that it's USDA certified by
22	a USDA-accredited certifier.

So we get this certified organic honey, and it comes with a certificate that says that it's certified to the NOP standards by a USDA-accredited So in -- I then did -- investigated and certifier. looked at the standards to -- under which it was certified, and they are not USDA. I mean, they are in the standards because there are standards, so they are just sort of these standards for honey production that this certifier uses.

MR. KARREMAN: So then you probably shouldn't be certifying that or putting a PCO label on it.

MS. ZUCK: Well, the way I understand it, that if -- you know, I can't really look behind the USDA certificate that states that. I mean, my job is to make sure the certificate is valid, which it is, and I can't really go past that and check to see at the farm level that it was done properly. If I did that with everything, I don't think that I'd really be allowed to do that even -- question other certifier's certificates.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: Andrea, then Bea.
2	MS. CAROE: Just a quick question.
3	Leslie, could you disclose to us how you found out
4	that that label problem was happening? Was that
5	through enforcement that you found out, or was that
6	your own monitoring surveillance and
7	MS. ZUCK: Our client had a regional
8	distributor that found it in the stores and
9	MS. CAROE: So it was reported back to you
LO	
11	MS. ZUCK: By the client.
L2	MS. CAROE: by private industry.
L3	MS. ZUCK: By the client.
L4	MS. CAROE: Okay. Thank you. I just was
L5	curious.
L6	MS. ZUCK: No one would have known there
L7	was anything wrong with it.
L8	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: Okay. Bea?
L9	MS. JAMES: I have just some you know,
20	a series of questions to help me understand exactly
21	why you think it's important for a retailer to be
22	certified in order to sell a private label product.

1	So bear with me, okay?
2	If a retailer if a retailer is
3	certified, say, in the grocery department, what are
4	just like the basic things that they have to do to be
5	in compliance for that certification? And I think I
6	know, but I just I'd like to hear from you.
7	MS. ZUCK: In the grocery as in the
8	their store? We don't certify any retailers, so you
9	might be asking the wrong person.
10	MS. JAMES: Okay.
11	MS. ZUCK: What we do is we certify
12	branded products
13	MS. JAMES: Okay. Okay.
14	MS. ZUCK: that are you know, we
15	looked at the ingredients, and, you know, we mainly
16	we checked the label to make sure the label is proper
17	and the, you know, amounts of labels that are used
18	matches the amounts of product
19	MS. JAMES: Okay.
20	MS. ZUCK: that was produced, that sort
21	of thing.
22	MS. JAMES: So it's my understanding that

1	if you're certified in the grocery department, that
2	that means that you have to make sure that you're
3	handling and receiving and that you're you're not
4	commingling, even though that's difficult to do,
5	because a lot of those packages are packaged anyway.
6	Correct?
7	MS. ZUCK: Yes.
8	MS. JAMES: Okay. So that's kind of like
9	the basic cartoon version of retail
10	MS. ZUCK: I'm sure it's pretty simple
11	with packaged products, yes.
12	MS. JAMES: So I'm trying to figure out
13	how does that help quality control, for a retailer to
14	be certified in the grocery department, if they want
15	to sell private label organic pasta sauce? How does
16	that help you monitor your quality control, and really
17	their they are are being certified to make sure
18	that their handling and receiving and commingling and
19	store operational level of organic compliance is done
20	at that level?
21	But if, say, a retailer is just
22	contracting out to have pasta sauce with their label

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

on it, that they don't manufacturer, they don't have any involvement whatsoever except to say, "Here's the artwork for our brand logo, and can you please make sure that that's a part of this," you know, that's on -- that's on this package.

MS. ZUCK: There's a couple of things that can happen. You know, we are only certifying the plant that makes that soup or that canned good, or whatever it might be, and we -- we know how much they make, what they put into it, how many labels they put, and how much they shipped.

But if the store is putting, you know, other -- having contracted with another certified producer to put it on -- to make it as well, it is not certified by us, we don't know that, we -- you know, it's --

MS. JAMES: I'm not sure I follow you, because if you certify a plant to produce -- to make pasta sauce, and that retailer contracts with them to put their label on something that the plant is fully responsible for for making that thev're sure in compliance with the organic regulations for

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

manufacturing and handling, I just don't see the connection for -- for making sure that that grocery retailer is certified at the retail level.

And the only reason I -- I bring this up is because I think that it would actually hurt a lot of manufacturers if that stipulation was put on a retailer in order to sell an organic product. I think there is an exception. I think there are some retailers that definitely go above and beyond and want to have more involvement and want to be to use that seal, and that's fine.

But because of the exemption, I think that the real -- and tell me if I'm wrong here, but, I how drive mean, can we continue to retail certification when there's not clear, concise retail certification guidelines that we have. And why would we -- why would we press that issue in the retail level when, really, the bigger issue has to do with the fact that there is no guidelines for retailers. They're being certified as a handler.

CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: Comment from Barbara Robinson, AMS.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MS. ROBINSON: Leslie, I'm -- let me try to help answer Bea by asking you -- I think isn't -- isn't what you're trying to say is the fact that you have -- if you had a relationship with this retailer whereby, based on what I heard you say, you had access to records, you had access to records about the product itself, so that you can trace back beyond just what is on that label, you have some -- you have some access to the traceability that gives you this comfort level about what's behind the label on that product, that you do have more of a comfort level about your logo on that private label.

And that's what's discomforting to you is a private label that just may say "PCO certified" on the label. Okay, fine, but you don't know really what was in the -- it's -- okay, let's just take, you know, vegetable soup. You have nothing -- you don't know anything about what's in that can of vegetable soup because it was co-packed someplace else.

But if you have an agremeent with the store, and so you've got access to those records, whereby you can go in and see, okay, are all the

1	contents of that vegetable soup actually produced to
2	NOP standards that then then you've got a better
3	you've got a better relationship and
4	MS. ZUCK: Well, as Bea has said, I've
5	done that already at the production level. And to
6	explain it one step futher, from I'll just tell you
7	in real life what it cuts down to is these are not
8	processed products that were I'm talking about with
9	PCO. They are large quantities of mushrooms and large
10	quantities of eggs. Okay?
11	So these products can you know, are
12	just basically sent to the store, overwrapped, and
13	gone, or they're done at the plant and gone. So, you
14	know, the you know, the idea that we don't we
15	can't follow up with any of that is is really, you
16	know
17	MS. JAMES: Is that the retailers' fault,
18	or is that the person that you certified, the plant
19	that you certified?
20	MS. ZUCK: Well, it is, but, you know
21	and there's also repacking of produce like oranges and
22	things that, you know, say certified organic by PCO.

1	And we're in Pennsylvania, so that's kind of odd. But
2	we get a lot of people calling us up and saying you
3	know, they have a complaint about the eggs, and we
4	and it's, you know, in a carton with the store brand
5	up in Connecticut or something, and we don't know how
6	you know, we really don't know much about how they
7	got there from the distributor.
8	I mean, they go to the distributor and
9	they go you know, these retail distributors are
10	huge, and then they go to all these stores.
11	I feel like I'm taking a lot of time.
12	We don't have any traceability once it
13	goes to the distributorship, and then it goes to 50
14	million stores, and, you know, I
15	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: I have George, Julie,
16	and Andrea. But I'd like to remind the Board that
17	there's only 15 minutes left in public comment, and we
18	still have five people signed up, so George?
19	MR. SIEMON: What's the difference between
20	somebody out there putting your seal on their package
21	and somebody moving from a certified plant to a non-
22	certified plant and putting a private label or a

branded? What's the difference? Someone has illegally applied your seal to a product that was not certified by you. What's the difference between private label and branded in that illegal incident?

MS. ZUCK: I'm going to say one more thing and then I will -- the way it really happens is there are these producers of mushrooms or eggs, and they're farmers, and they don't have a really huge operation. Like, in Pennsylvania, they're not as big as maybe in the Midwest. And this big supermarket comes to them and says, "We want to market organic eggs under our store label."

And the farmer gets really excited, "My gosh, Giant is going to buy my eggs, and this is so exciting." And so they call us up and they say, "What do we want to do? Giant wants to put, you know, our eggs in their cartons and call them organic. And don't they have to identify a certifier?"

And, yes, they have to identify a certifier, which is PCO. So, and then we tell them we have to have a private label agreement with this, so we can like -- if there's a customer complaint, we can

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	go inspect the premises, or we can at least call them
2	up and they'll tell us something and they'll talk to
3	us about it, you know?
4	And they're like, oh gosh, I don't know if
5	they're going to do that, you know? Well, you know,
6	if they want to get certified if they want to get
7	organic eggs, we have to do that.
8	MR. SIEMON: I'm asking about the plant
9	who has illegally applied your label. It's their
10	responsibility to put the seal on there. That plant
11	has done the illegal activity, putting a seal on there
12	that was not who they were certified by.
13	MS. ZUCK: Yes. Well, we're trying to
14	prevent more of these, you know, problems from
15	happening. Illegal
16	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: Well, we're not going
17	to resolve that today. Andrea has a very quick point,
18	she promises.
19	MS. CAROE: Just one quick point, and
20	everybody should remember that when you're talking
21	about store private labels, the only one that has
22	control over that label is the retailer. And the

1	gross assumption you cannot make is that the co-packer
2	we're aware of is the only one that's applying that
3	label.
4	MS. ZUCK: Yes.
5	MS. CAROE: You can't make that
6	assumption. This is not the first time we've heard of
7	this. It has happened before. And the only way that
8	we'll work this out is to be able to understand what
9	happens in that retail operation when they're applying
LO	a label that they own.
L1	MS. ZUCK: And the stores often refuse to
L2	sign these contracts because they don't want anybody
L3	inspecting their store.
L4	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: All right. Thanks,
L5	Leslie.
L6	MS. ZUCK: Sorry.
L7	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: That's fine. It
L8	wasn't your fault people asked questions.
L9	(Laughter.)
20	We have Marty Mesh.
21	PARTICIPANT: He's coming. He
22	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: Well, he may have
1	

1	missed his
2	PARTICIPANT: He's right here.
3	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: Okay. In the nick of
4	time, and then and Julia Sabin is next.
5	And, Marty, do you have a proxy?
6	MR. MESH: I do. Steve Walker.
7	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: Okay. Steve Walker.
8	MR. MESH: Well, you've heard the
9	articulate, and you've heard the succinct. Now for a
10	change.
11	I want to thank the my name is Marty
12	Mesh, M-E-S-H, the Executive Director of Florida
13	Organic Growers Quality Certification Services, and as
14	is usual, a member of the Board of Directors of the
15	Organic Trade Association, although my comments do not
16	represent the official position of the OTA.
17	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: Please speak into the
18	mike. Get a little closer.
19	MR. MESH: I wanted to thank Board members
20	for your efforts over the last few days. Thanks to
21	Tony and USDA for making the hotel available.
22	In relation to Mark's comments, there's

lots of other hotels available. The metro system has worked well for -- for me, and I would be willing to take any farmer under my wing and show them how to save money in Washington, D.C. by --

(Laughter.)

-- finding alternative living arrangements.

It does bring up the point about having meetings outside of D.C., though, and I think that that point deserves to be considered. Again, the meetings used to be outside of D.C.

I believe the NOSB, a group of committed volunteers from different stakeholder groups needs to have increased resources in order to do what's being expected of them, including adequate scientific help accessible for them, and I think it would make your job easier.

I think you're being held to -- to -- I think your job description has grown, and the expectation is that maybe even the program staff -- is putting on you are not workable given the resources that you have.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

I, too, have a concern about what I thought about was unfunded mandates of certifiers. You know, annotation has always kind of caused concerns, but if carried out will only translate to increased costs for certified entities.

Michael Sligh's comments articulated well the potential unintended consequences of the organic seed requirements affecting local seed viability. seed-gathering discussion, while from macro conceptual point includes admirable reasons, the in implementation and suitability variance and regional specificity of plant varieties, the likelihood that the data, if gathered, and if turned is misinterpreted for private corporate gain, in, private profit, or not available in a timely manner, high well the effects is as as very internationally/locally adapted seed varieties that are typically and historically used in organic seed production.

After all, it brings -- it brought the memory back of the certificate discussion. We, as certifiers, always wanted dates on the certificates,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

that as certifiers the industry and consumers raised numerous concerns. What we were promised by the national organic program staff was a national database — was held up as the solution. And years later the situation remains the same, where dates on certificates would be helpful in the field.

The database is yet to be implemented, and it's not due to the program staffs, you know, not caring about things. It's just other priorities have taken -- have taken their attention, I assume, or the resources haven't been there.

Speaking of resources, this brings me to the -- to the proposal which I brought forward, and which was brought forward by others as well years ago, for which there was lukewarm reception, and, no, it compensating farmers for wasn't for governmentmandated spray programs, which that concern still is there in the case of citrus growers arowina Valencia oranges.

Under the current program, they can still lose access to the organically-grown label for two years without any compensation for the increased cost

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

of farming in a more sustainable manner, and the public benefits which accompany that. Those public benefits, while becoming more well-known, have not been espoused with U.S. Government help as the purported benefits of biotech have enjoyed through the years.

But concerning unfunded mandates and lack of resources for this industry to grow, I, once again, bring up the idea of a simple one percent retail check-off. Yes, years ago it was a half of one percent retail check-off -- which would mean a 99-cent yellow squash would sell on the retail level for one dollar.

The retail sector, where a large amount of the money is the money -- a disproportionate amount of the money is which -- that price captures the whole supply chain, on the U.S. national retail sales now exceeds \$7- to \$8 billion. And so for the sake of easy math, I used \$10 billion, given the continued growth of the industry. One percent is \$100 million.

Certification could be free. I'd be more than happy to gather seed data and turn it all in to

NEAL R. GROSS

the U.S. Government with some additional resources on the certification end.

Certifiers -- the \$50 million that we advocated for for organic research would be there. Money to do research education would be available in a painless -- in a more painless way, funded on the back end, not the front end, at the farm gate level or the source.

An organic producer in Florida who was devastated by the 2004 hurricane season, crop disaster payment, e-mails, there's a lot of work to do at the USDA. I'll just read this one line into the record

As she -- as they were still trying to get hurricane disaster benefits, which I'm not sure how the use of methyl bromide, you know, keeps a hurricane from affecting you, but it -- this talks about their -- their application for assistance is denied because fumigation is a requirement for aquaculture practices. There is no authority to implement provisions differently than contained in the regulation.

The idea that -- that organic producers can't take advantage of other USDA program disasters

because of the bias still held to organic is troubling and remains so.

And then, I need to comment about organic fish. The National Organic Program Director came to Florida in a public setting, spoke about if you can produce a fish in -- you know, under this program by feeding all organic feed, then by God you can sell it and you can put a USDA logo on it.

Companies took the U.S. National Organic Program Director at his word, invested several hundred thousands of dollars into, you know, designing a production system, implementing a production system, carrying it out, certifying it, have been feeding at great cost -- I mean, if there's any livestock producers in here that know the difference between sourcing conventional feed and sourcing certified organic feed, and feeding livestock, the cost is considerable.

And they've been doing that. They have been feeding 100 percent certified organic feed to shrimp. And, yes, they put the USDA logo on it. We have, as their certifier, asked and requested, and I

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	thought they had removed it and taken it off, but, you
2	know, we also, on behalf of our certified entities,
3	petitioned the USDA quite some time ago to engage in
4	expedited rulemaking I believe is the phrase that I
5	used in relation to aquaculture.
6	And, you know, these producers are trying
7	to hang on by a thread, competing against shrimp that
8	isn't fed organic feed, but yet carries organic shrimp
9	on it. I would think that my colleagues from
10	Consumers Union and the Center for Food Safety would
11	be more concerned about shrimp that's not fed organic
12	feed than shrimp that is fed 100 percent organic feed.
13	And I understand the consumer the
14	consumer confusion, and that's why we asked for and
15	requested expedited rulemaking.
16	I have five more minutes, I thought,
17	Goldie.
18	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: No.
19	MS. CAUGHLAN: You have used up nine.
20	MR. MESH: Oh.
21	(Laughter.)
22	Damn. All right. Well, then, I would

like to clarify the private label issue. This is the same -- not the same jar, but the same product that I used for Keith in Atlanta at the accreditation training to try to illustrate the idea of private labeling with the concern.

This is coffee, obviously, that's grown in various countries, a blend of coffees. You know, packed in Germany in probably a certified facility, packed for a distributor in New Jersey. The point that certifiers have or the concern that certifiers have, if the distributor -- if the private label isn't certified, nobody has access to know how many -- how many --

CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: Finish your thought.

MR. MESH: -- jars of coffee there are, and how many plants throughout the world are actually producing this jar with these labels. You know, if -- if you go to one facility, you can audit how much coffee came in and how many jars went out. You don't know if there's more jars, more factories in other countries producing the same jar.

This jar is in every store there is.

1	There is a lot of organic instant, you know, coffee
2	that, believe me, people are paying a premium price
3	for being sold. And so that's the concern, at least
4	from my point of view, of certifiers not having access
5	to those records. You know, who has those records,
6	who has access to them, and can we vouch for the
7	integrity of the product.
8	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: Thanks, Marty.
9	MR. MESH: Questions on shrimp or other
10	produce?
11	MS. KOENIG: My question is well, no,
12	my statement and it you know, it has to do with
13	Michael Sligh's comment, and you also said it, and I
14	think that there's confusion. And maybe I'm confused
15	as to the way we propose this organic seed under three
16	you know, in terms of land races and and, you
17	know, developing countries and subsistence farmers
18	trying to get into organic
19	MR. MESH: Or Florida farmers.
20	MS. KOENIG: Well, but if you look at
21	it's A, B, and C, or the research. Okay? So, in
22	other words, you know, if they can justify non-organic

1	seed based on the attributes you know, it's a land
2	race, it's adapted to the specific geographical
3	region, our policy I don't think is different than
4	what has been sort of the commercial availability
5	clause.
6	But, you know, or, if you're going to say
7	"research," you know, if you're going to use the
8	research and say, "Well, no, the research doesn't
9	prove it," if you're just going to use that, it says
10	that if you do research to prove it, then you have to
11	do, you know, evaluative research. And maybe and
12	that's how I understand "or." It's not "and, and,
13	and."
14	So I don't know, we can maybe try to get a
15	clarification of that.
16	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: Thanks for that,
17	Rose. Thanks, Marty.
18	Okay. Julia Sabin, and then Aaron Zeis.
19	Julia?
20	MS. SABIN: My name is Julia Sabin,
21	General Manager of Smucker Quality Beverages. Good
22	morning, National Organic Standards Board, National

Organic Program, and interested members of the organic community.

SQB procures organic ingredients, manufactures and markets a number of organic products under our brands of R.W. Knudsen, After the Fall, and Natural Brew, as well as our all-organic brand of Santa Cruz Organic.

SQB has submitted a list of materials to the National Organic Program and the National Organic Standards Board that we believe are essential for the continued use in our handling operation, and those of the farmers and ingredient suppliers.

We encourage the NOSB and the Secretary of Agriculture to keep those materials on the national list. We thank you for the timely posting of sunset review comments and encourage the NOP to continue to post all comments and Board recommendations for transparency.

Any documents that the Board utilizes as information to assist them in materials review should also be timely placed on the NOP website for the public to view.

1	In closing, we encourage the NOSB and NOP
2	to work in conjunction with the organic industry on
3	reclassifying materials and clarifying definitions.
4	It is critical that recommendations made by this Board
5	take public comment into consideration, are consistent
6	with OFPA and with past board recommendations.
7	As always, we continue to fully support
8	the NOP and the NOSB and thank you for all your
9	tremendous work and dedication.
10	Thank you.
11	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: Thanks, Julia.
12	Aaron Zeis? And then next up is Emily
13	Brown Rosen. And before you start, Aaron, I just want
14	to know if Mark Cox or Christine Cox are here, or Mark
15	Retzloff. Okay. So Aaron, and then Emily.
16	MR. ZEIS: My name is Aaron Zeis.
17	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: Zeis, I'm sorry.
18	MR. ZEIS: That's quite all right. Z-E-I-
19	S. And I am a farmer of three acres of mixed produce
20	and I serve as Administrative Director for Indiana
21	Certified Organic.
22	Good morning, members of the Board and NOP

and guests. I would like to thank you for the opportunity to share my views with you.

Today I'm here representing my opinions as an organic farmer and consumer. I have just a couple of items I would like to briefly address. The first is with regards to the USDA NOP certification of personal care products. I do believe there is a huge demand for personal care items that consumers can trust be free of chemicals and synthetic ingredients.

I do understand that the authority with regards to personal care items is the FDA. However, consumers of many are requesting regulation and oversight on these items than the FDA is already providing. I do not have the perfect solution. However, I am aware of the cooperation and collaboration with other governmental agencies in the NOP, such as the EPA, with regard to pesticide reviews to NOP standards and the FSIS reviews of organic meat labels, TTB reviews of organic alcohol labels, and even the FDA with regard to livestock supplements.

I would hope there could be some point of

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

FDA review or cooperation with NOP to ensure the concerned public is not exposed to harmful chemicals such as thalades, aluminum compounds, or sodium laurel sulfate.

My second item is in reference to the guidance on the commercial availability of organic seed. I would like to thank the Board for addressing this item, as I believe it to be a major problem in the organic industry and a loophole that some farmers may choose to fudge.

I understand there is a large quantity of organic seed that is not being purchased due to this very problem.

I would like to approach the topic first from the vantage point of an organic farmer who grows over 75 varieties of produce, which is really not all that uncommon among diversified produce growers. The of research and replications for all concepts varieties is a completely impossible task. Jim and I spend many hours each year searching for organic seed and documenting my attempt when the particular variety lettuce suited by my climate is not

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

commercially available.

There are thousands of tomato varieties, and many of the same varieties with different names by different seed companies. So hopefully you can see some of the confusion that may arise.

As a certifier, to document the nomenclature of all seed which is reported to be commercially unavailable and cross-reference this to which is available and report this annually, monthly, or daily to the NOP is something beyond comprehension.

Crop failures, weather difficulties, and other factors may leave a farmer without many choices late in the season. How can we really distinguish this with those who are trying to find the cheaper route?

This is a task which can be -- which -this is a task which would place an overwhelming
burden on the certifier, with an increase of labor
requirements for all certifiers across the board,
therefore likely affecting certification costs and
paperwork for farmers.

I believe the commercially-available

NEAL R. GROSS

1	loophole is a problem and needs attention, and I
2	appreciate the work that the Board has put into this
3	recommendation. However, I believe it has not been
4	addressed from the viewpoint of farmers and
5	certifiers.
6	I am aware of the organic seed list
7	available through ATTRA and other certification
8	agencies, and maybe there could be a list created in
9	which all seed companies may post varieties available
10	on perhaps the NOP website.
11	I once again realize that I may not have
12	the perfect solution, but I believe the proposed
13	recommendation to be unreasonable.
14	I would like to thank the NOP and the NOSB
15	well, I'd like to thank the NOSB for passing the
16	pasture recommendation yesterday, and I would like to
17	thank you all for all of your hard work.
18	Thank you.
19	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: Thanks, Aaron.
20	Okay. Emily Brown Rosen is the last
21	commenter signed up.
22	MS. ROSEN: Thanks. Emily Brown Rosen,

Organic Research Associates. I just will be very brief and -- I don't want to drag this out, but looking forward on the sunset process, I just had a couple of points to make here, since that's your next big job here.

I support -- I'm glad you gave that review of items that you think are obviously in need of review. I think those were all good choices. I'd just like to point out a couple more.

The NOSB originally reviewed and recommended a two-year sunset on a couple of specific items back in 1995. So considering that it's 10 years later, I think it's probably a good idea now.

One of them was chlorine, and chlorine I know you worked on, you know, trying to change the annotation two years ago. We still haven't got that annotation anywhere achieved, and it is a very widely misinterpreted substance on the list. I believe it's being used at all different rates with all different justification. It's kind of hard for -- you know, it's just not consistent.

And I would like to point your attention

to a comment that has been already posted by Sanderson from Jonathan Sprouts that's the processing list. He wrote a very good comment about the use of chlorine in sprout treatment, which is a You know, he claims that it's being real concern. allowed at 20,000 parts per million, which is an FDA guideline for sprout safety at this point in organic production, and that the residues can be up to 16,000 parts per million, which is -- this is not an organic product.

You know, I don't think if consumers knew there was that much chlorine residue in the product they would think it was organic. So we need to look at that. I mean, he -- and he has an alternate method for doing it that involves a lot of testing and good HACCP management. So it's something that should be addressed.

The other item that was a two-year sunset was in crops -- streptomycin and tetracycline as antibiotics for use in bacterial disease control. I think there are alternatives out there. They might not be totally satisfactory, but it's time to revisit

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

that and let people come to the floor to say, you know, we do or we don't need that.

But I think it's -- it was questionable at the time, and with the concern about antibiotics in general being applied in the environment I think that would be a good one.

The other thing I wanted to say was that I was very impressed with your new TAP reviewers from Virginia who did the sucrose octanoate ester and the chitosan reviews. I think they're a good resource, and that when you -- they seem to be particularly well informed as far as regulatory status and FDA status of different items, because that's not always easy to figure out. I know from having to dig it up in the past.

So as we go forward, one other item, then, would be nutrient vitamins and minerals in food processing. Depending on how the Harvey thing shakes out, there is going to be a need to determine which nutrients are really required by law, you know, if they're going to be -- continue to be allowed in organic food. And I think that could be a helpful

resource.

Looking through that and making sure that we get a real good clarification, it's not all of them, it's -- you know, there's certain ones, and it's, you know, lots of different conflicting regulations there. So just a heads up.

Thanks very much, and you did a great job this time. There was a lot of hard work, so good luck.

CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: Thanks, Emily.

And we will take a 15-minute break, and then come back with the committee chair work plan reports. And before you do that, as you give it thought over break, one of the first items that each committee chair needs to do is finalize recommendations from this meeting, feed them back into me to submit to the program. So keep that in mind.

All right. Fifteen-minute break. Be back at, let's say, 25 after. That's even a little longer than 15.

(Whereupon, the proceedings in the foregoing matter went off the record at

NEAL R. GROSS

10:10 a.m., and went back on the record at 10:30 a.m.)

CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: Please take your seats, and we'll resume business with the committee chair reports on future work plan items. And as we have done in the past couple meetings now, you know, we can have a very brief and focused discussion of those if other members of the Board have any questions to clarify or if NOP has any input on those proposals, and also if you would kind of prioritize and a little timeline so that we can project what's coming up when.

So -- I'm sorry, can't think of everything. So, who would like to go first? Kevin, are you prepared for Handling Committee?

VICE CHAIRPERSON O'RELL: The Handling Committee work plan -- the first item, high priority is the -- will be taking the issue on the ag/non-ag that was deferred after a very spirited debate. Αt this meeting we'll be requesting an expedited TAP review, full TAP review, for yeast, so we can get some information manufacturing on the process, both conventional and organic, at least in Europe. We'll

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	be looking at the public comment, and we'll be
2	proposing a new recommendation.
3	Sunset material review process of
4	course, we'll be reviewing the public comments and
5	moving forward on those materials that we marked as a
6	priority colors, flavors, and yeast as well as
7	looking at other materials on that list to see if any
8	ones are highlighted as being needed to move up on the
9	priority list.
10	Pet Food Task Force we'll continue to
11	be an observer/participant in the Pet Food Task Force
12	as it moves forward towards its recommendation to the
13	Board. And then we'll be reviewing any petitioned
14	substance substances as as required. We'll also
15	be working on the determination of a commercial
16	availability criteria in cooperation with the Policy
17	Development Committee.
18	That's what we have on our plan currently.
19	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: Okay. Any questions
20	from Board members, comments? George?
21	MR. SIEMON: Generally commercially
22	available for which parts, the ingredients, the 605

1	I mean
2	VICE CHAIRPERSON O'RELL: Six. Yes, 606.
3	MR. SIEMON: 606, I'm sorry. That
4	section.
5	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: Substances that are
6	petitioned to place on 606, both the criteria and
7	procedures for those reviews, right?
8	VICE CHAIRPERSON O'RELL: Yes.
9	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: Okay. Any other
10	comments? All right. Thanks, Kevin.
11	Dave, are you ready?
12	MR. CARTER: Yes. The Police Committee,
13	we really have six things on our plate right now.
14	First of all, as Kevin mentioned, we'll be working
15	with the Handling Committee on the determination of
16	the commercial availability under 205.606.
17	Secondly is to obtain the public comments
18	and then to develop the final recommendation on the
19	temporary variances for research document.
20	Third is the continuing saga, the
21	neverending saga of Board policy manual revisions, as
22	that goes on.

Fourth is the completion of the -- what we're affectionately calling the Board Member 101 document, which is essentially the orientation and overview for the new Board members that Bea and Rigo have been working on.

Fifth, the new item that got assigned to us this morning was the review of potential separation.

us this morning was the review of potential separation of mineral source supplements from ag source supplements, and going through some of those materials and seeing how we might move forward.

And then, six is just an analysis of the issues relating to the remediation of the court order based upon the document that NOP provided us is how we might feed back then on NOSB and the collaboration and in working forward to address those issues.

And then, the final thing we have on the work plan is the Policy Committee is in charge of planning the graduation party for the class of 2006.

(Laughter.)

Which class has gotten through without any drop-outs or any flunk-outs. We've gone through intact, so --

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: Was that the highest priority?

(Laughter.)

Any questions, comments, members of the Board first? And I do have -- I would just like to have a little bit more discussion about this input on the court ruling. When Barbara spoke with us on Monday, the Board was invited to provide our ideas and input, and that needs to happen in a timely manner to have any, you know, value to the program is my understanding.

And so I have spoken with Bea about this, and Bea has offered to serve as kind of a clearinghouse to help consolidate ideas from Board members.

And then, so I ask that all Board members submit your ideas on all or any part of the court ruling and how the rule can be changed to come into compliance, and then Bea and I will work together to construct a letter to the Secretary essentially, as this will not be, you know, a Board recommendation that waits for the next meeting, but rather a letter

1	from the Chair on behalf of the Board.
2	So once Bea and I have a draft, then it
3	will be circulated for your sign-on, your concurrence
4	with that. So that's the plan.
5	Bea, do you have
6	MS. JAMES: Well, are we looking for a
7	particular date to try to have all the information?
8	Because it will take a while to make that into a
9	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: Right.
10	MS. JAMES: a presentable letter.
11	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: Yes. And we didn't
12	talk about that. You know, if members have what is
13	reasonable? I mean, a month is reasonable, but two
14	weeks is ideal.
15	Andrea?
16	MS. CAROE: I'm a little bit unclear on
17	what we are doing. I mean, I saw our role with this
18	court order remediation to be one of in collaboration
19	assisting the program with implementing necessary
20	changes. I didn't see our role as determining what
21	the remediation changes are, so I I'm not quite

sure what this clearinghouse is. This is the first

1	I've heard of it.
2	And what kind of letter we're sending to
3	the Secretary, I'm very concerned about about this
4	action. It doesn't seem appropriate to me for this
5	Board.
6	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: We were invited to
7	provide our ideas.
8	MS. CAROE: To the Secretary or to the
9	program?
LO	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: Well, I use those
L1	interchangeably. The Secretary is the program, or the
L2	program I mean, to the program but, I mean, it's
L3	yes, it's to the program.
L4	MS. CAROE: To the program. That's I
L5	think that's more
L6	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: Right. I mean, we
L7	exist to provide advice to the Secretary under
L8	statute, but it is the program in reality.
L9	MS. CAROE: Well, it
20	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: At any rate, we were
21	invited to provide our ideas up front, and then once
22	the proposed and then, there will be a time period

1	where we're not engaged, where the rule-writing is
2	occurring
3	MS. CAROE: Right.
4	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: and then, once the
5	proposed rule comes out, then we would provide advice,
6	or I may not be on the Board by that time, who knows,
7	but, you know, the Board would provide a response as a
8	commenter to the proposed rule. But we were invited
9	to provide input, ideas, and to be considered.
10	MS. CAROE: Okay. Well, this seems like
11	duplicative of what Dave has just presented on the
12	Policy Committee as doing, and that's opening that
13	dialogue.
14	MR. CARTER: I think this is in in
15	accordance with the Policy Committee. I mean, just a
16	member of the Policy Committee, Bea is going to serve
17	as the primary person on the Policy Committee to
18	coordinate that material. We will continue to run
19	that through the Policy Committee.
20	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: Right, yes. That was
21	just
22	MS. KOENIG: I guess I just had a question

	on the process. So we'll all will the will they
2	be discussed like the different ideas, is it just a
3	long list of some of our potential solutions, or are
4	they actually going to be judged and weighed by the
5	entire Board, and then which is very different.
6	I mean, I don't mind instead of
7	individually going in with our ideas, if we want to
8	compile all our ideas and saying this was not voted
9	on, these are just our ideas, that's very different
10	than because I don't think we have the time and
11	really the process to do that in a recommendation.
12	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: Right. I agree. And
13	that would be a collection of ideas.
14	MS. KOENIG: Okay.
15	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: And I think that
16	could be the most valuable to the program. There may
17	be some things, you know, that we come up with that
18	have no value. There may be some new ideas that
19	MS. JAMES: I think the input is to help
20	the NOP. I mean, it's ideas and feedback and thoughts
21	and that that revolve around this particular issue
22	that we will present to them to help them make sure

1	that they've looked at all different kinds of
2	possibilities.
3	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: And as much as we
4	can, you know, pros and cons, potential impacts as
5	well, and that's what Barbara was saying.
6	MS. JAMES: It's not necessarily taking a
7	position on anything.
8	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: Right.
9	MS. KOENIG: What I would just suggest is
10	that, then, if somebody you know, of course, if
11	people don't have time, they can just come up with an
12	idea. If somebody wants to go in individually and
13	give the pros and cons, I just don't want to see some
14	analysis of individual ideas. I don't think that's
15	our role.
16	You know, if you personally want to do an
17	analysis, that's fine. But what I'm saying is I don't
18	want the committee to take all of our ideas and then
19	do some microanalysis and say
20	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: No. I think we're
21	all
22	MS. KOENIG: That's fine.

1	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: on the same page.
2	MS. KOENIG: Okay.
3	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: If you submit an
4	idea, and you look at it from both sides, pros and
5	cons, great.
6	MS. KOENIG: Okay.
7	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: We'll see what we
8	get. But as far as your timeline, what should we say?
9	Would you like to suggest something?
10	MS. JAMES: I think if I think if the
11	committee has a month to do that, and to get that back
12	to me, and then I'll try to construct it and send that
13	to you. And I don't think that we should submit
14	anything without the whole Board getting a chance to
15	look at it also.
16	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: Yes, definitely. So
17	a month being for members to submit something to you?
18	MS. JAMES: Yes. Yes.
19	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: Okay. And then,
20	we'll try and turn it around in a week's time
21	hopefully, but whatever you know, within two weeks.
22	Let's set ourselves two weeks

1	MS. JAMES: Within two weeks.
2	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: after that, and
3	then it will be circulated to the Board, and at that
4	time I'll set a deadline for you to respond, and once
5	we have something out to you. It'll probably be about
6	a week at that stage. So it's going to keep getting
7	narrower.
8	Okay. Thanks. I'm glad we had that
9	discussion.
LO	All right. Nancy, are you ready for
L1	Crops?
L2	MS. OSTIGUY: We are going to be revising
L3	the compost and compost tea recommendations based upon
L4	the input that we've been getting, write Q&As for
L5	compost and compost tea to accompany that
L6	recommendation, then sunset review with the materials
L7	that we are going to need to be looking at, and then
L8	the three that have come up in during the meeting
L9	for streptomycin and tetracycline.
20	Contaminants in fertilizer, so try to
21	delineate the issue so that we can begin to get to a
22	point where we may have a recommendation.

1	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: I'm sorry. Could you
2	repeat that?
3	MS. OSTIGUY: Contaminants in fertilizers.
4	Then, because we have continued to get comments on
5	the commercial availability of organic seeds, to look
6	at those to assess what the impact is going to be on
7	you know, to look at that and assess the impacts
8	based upon the input that we have received.
9	There may be things that we didn't
10	recognize is what I'm I'm not saying we're
11	necessarily going to revisit it, but to make sure that
12	we have taken into account public comment and see if
13	what we view what we view that impact might be, if
14	it's something that we might need to address or not.
15	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: Okay. So even though
16	the Board adopted it I just want to be clear are
17	you suggesting we hold that at committee before
18	submitting it to the program, or
19	MS. OSTIGUY: No. I'm not even saying
20	that there's necessarily anything to change.
21	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: Yes.
22	MS. OSTIGUY: But I don't think we should

1	ignore the public comment that has come in.
2	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: No, no.
3	MS. OSTIGUY: That is really, it's to
4	look at that public comment to see whether or not
5	those items are potentially going to be problematic.
6	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: Okay. And is that
7	something that can happen along with a recommendation
8	when we submit it to the program?
9	MS. OSTIGUY: Sure. Sure.
LO	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: So that they have a
L1	little analysis of those comments and how it relates.
L2	Okay. Thanks. Anything else?
L3	MS. OSTIGUY: The goal is not to hold back
L4	that.
L5	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: Okay.
L6	MS. OSTIGUY: No, that's let's see.
L7	Obviously, all the decision sheets need to be done at
L8	some point or another. It's on our agenda. I don't
L9	believe it will be done by the next meeting, or the
20	materials soy protein isolate and ammonia
21	bicarbonate no, we did finish synthetic, didn't we?
2	No

1	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: The synthetic/non-
2	synthetic, yes.
3	MS. OSTIGUY: Okay.
4	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: The recommendation,
5	and then you have
6	MS. OSTIGUY: Now we can do yes, so
7	we'll be looking at the two materials soy protein
8	isolate and ammonia bicarbonate to bring those up
9	to for Board recommendation. Well, we have the
10	recommendation.
11	And then, last but not least,
12	hydroponics, the guidance document.
13	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: No. No, it's
14	continued on the work plan. There was some early
15	drafting, and it has never been
16	MS. OSTIGUY: It has never gotten
17	anywhere.
18	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: never moved
19	forward. Any comments, questions, for Nancy?
20	Okay. Andrea, are you ready?
21	MS. CAROE: Yes.
22	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: Okay.

MS. CAROE: We will submit the retailer Q&A. That passed without changes, so it's just going to put in the Board vote on that.

We will also submit the NOP -- the response to the NOP response to the ANSI report document, with the changes that were noted during the meeting. We'll further work on the peer review panel recommendation, again implementing or including as much of the public comment as seems warranted. And also, working in collaboration a little bit further with the program to make sure that that document is sound and has some -- some legs to move with.

And then, the last thing is kind of an open-ended thing, and I ask for some flexibility in the committee. Since we were told at this meeting that as those ANSI response items are being generated, they will be run through this committee, I want to keep the plate somewhere clear so that we can respond to those quickly.

So I've kind of got an open item that I can't really detail at this time, but that's it for this committee.

1	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: Okay. Sounds good.
2	Any questions, comments?
3	All right. Livestock? Michael, you are
4	prepared to take over as Chair and give the report
5	here, correct?
6	MR. LACY: I am totally unprepared to take
7	over as Chair.
8	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: But you are prepared
9	to give the report.
10	MR. LACY: Maybe.
11	(Laughter.)
12	George and I are transitioning the Chair
13	responsibilities, and I do want to thank George on
14	behalf of the Livestock Committee for the dedicated
15	leadership he has provided to the Livestock Committee.
16	We really do appreciate it, George.
17	I have only half-jokingly told him that
18	George Pierce will have to come to work for me for the
19	next
20	PARTICIPANT: Jim Pierce.
21	MR. LACY: Jim Pierce, excuse me, will
22	have to come to work for me for the next year, and

George has agreed to that.

(Laughter.)

We obviously have some work to continue to do on the pasture requirement, and we will work expeditiously with NOP to develop the clear rationale for the proposed rule change and guidance. In defense of NOP, the Livestock Committee, and I think the NOSB Board, we do appreciate the NOP being cautious on this.

We do understand that we need to get this right, and we appreciate their help in making sure that we do get it right.

We will continue to work with Nancy on development of standards for organic honey. On the materials side, we have work to do on the ibermectin and moxidectin issues, and we'll look at any other materials that need to be examined in regard to the sunset.

We'll continue to work with NOP on the impact of the court ruling and how that impacts livestock. We'll continue to monitor the avian influenza situation and how that might impact the

1	organic poultry sector.
2	We would like to we feel like we've got
3	to be proactive on this serious issue. Nancy and I
4	will work on a statement of how the organic poultry
5	or how organic poultry production should respond to
6	this animal and human health threat.
7	Aquaculture issue remains on our plate.
8	We'll monitor and assist the working groups, as
9	appropriate. And as I mentioned, George and I are
LO	trying to work together to make sure nothing drops
L1	through the crack during the transition. But please
L2	let me know if there is anything that you think the
L3	Livestock Committee needs to address.
L4	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: No, pet food is under
L5	Handling. But there is the aquaculture task or the
L6	aquatic species task force. Yes, you mentioned that.
L7	And Kevin did mention pet food, right?
L8	VICE CHAIRPERSON O'RELL: Right, yes.
L9	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: We've got them all
20	covered.
21	Yes, Andrea?
22	MS. CAROE: Just a question for you,

1	Michael. I mean, I believe, George, you've been on
2	the task force, listening in on the task force.
3	MR. SIEMON: Unfortunately, I missed the
4	first two calls, but I'm going to try to be on the
5	third one.
6	MS. CAROE: Okay. Well, I have been on
7	it, but is that something that's going to transition
8	over to Michael as well? Or are you going to
9	MR. SIEMON: We hadn't talked about that.
_0	I had hoped to keep doing that, but we haven't talked
.1	about that, so
.2	MS. CAROE: Okay.
_3	MR. SIEMON: But since I missed the first
_4	two calls, I'm off to a rough start here, I must
_5	admit.
-6	MS. OSTIGUY: I'm on that are you
-7	talking about the
-8	MS. CAROE: I know you're on it as well,
_9	but I I thought George was, and I didn't know if
20	that was okay.
21	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: So, yes, we
22	definitely have still have someone from Livestock

1	on there, too.
2	Okay. Is there any committee I missed?
3	MS. KOENIG: Me.
4	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: I'm so sorry.
5	Materials.
6	(Laughter.)
7	I don't know how that could happen.
8	MS. KOENIG: Well, actually, you know,
9	other than sunset, you know, I'm happy to say that
LO	there's not that much going on. Yes, that is good.
L1	No, but the big thing is in the short
L2	term, and it sounds like the committees are aware of
L3	it, that there are some materials that have come up
L4	during this meeting that we need to consider if we
-5	want to request a TAP on.
L6	And with that, although you guys have
L7	provided a request for a TAP, what I need specifically
L8	is if you really mean a full TAP, or do you have
9	specific questions, because as Arthur tries to deal
20	with the contractor and we've got a lot of
21	materials if there's only things that you have like

a specific question on, maybe like the -- these anti

1	you know, antibiotics, and you specifically want
2	them to go in depth on whether they're not you
3	know, some of that information on the ibermectin or
4	those kinds of things, because we do have some that
5	have sufficient information.
6	So that's up to the committees, just
7	provide either the saying you want a full TAP, or
8	we don't need a full TAP, we need specifically these
9	areas. So that's or, for example, if there's
10	alternatives, and you want them to concentrate on
11	alternatives, let us know.
12	And then, when it comes to the national
13	sunset process, I want to get hard copies of all of
14	the comments from Arthur. He's going to mail them to
15	me, and then he will mail them to each of the
16	department chairs. And I hope to help, you know, get
17	on your tails and send e-mails and find out kind
18	of record-keep to make sure things are on task.
19	So it's not that I'm going to be a pest,
20	but I am going to be a pest.
21	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: Good.
22	MS. KOENIG: So, you know, and that's all

I see myself as being an annoyance in the next few months.

(Laughter.)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

If I'm not enough of an annoyance, I'll call my committee members, and they can start being an annoyance to other people, too. Other than that, we do -- we have sent two important documents to the NOP, hopefully for concurrence.

So I'll just be in contact with them if they have any questions or just to try to get an idea where their know, if we're you concurrence procedures as far as the on our synthetic/non-synthetic and the legal aspects of that reorganization of the national list.

CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: And, Rose, I think it was yesterday you mentioned a form for committees to use.

MS. KOENIG: Yes. Well, I'll send what we have, the process that we have outlined. And it wasn't a -- it was kind of a generalized form. So I'll take a look at that, and I'll send it to the committees. If they feel that that's not useable --

1	as far as if we have technical reviews if we're
2	basing them on actual TAPs, other than comments, you
3	certainly can fill out our TAP process, our materials
4	process, you know, using those sheets.
5	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: The evaluation forms
6	that
7	MS. KOENIG: On the evaluation forms
8	for
9	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: For each substance.
10	You know, we need to just be clear what you need from
11	us.
12	MS. KOENIG: The way could I just say
13	the way I'm understanding it is on things that either
14	the public has determined that it needs to be reviewed
15	fully, you know, things that have been pinpointed by
16	public comment, or things that we have, we will
17	request a TAP a formal technical paper on that.
18	and I would like you to fill out the same forms as if
19	you're looking at a new material.
20	For those substances that the committee
21	looks at, where you haven't where you have only
22	received positive comment, I would like you to review

-- Arthur says there's archives now on the website of every -- all of the materials and information they have on the materials. It's maybe not complete, so each committee should go in and review the technical information that's available.

And certainly fill out the forms that we requested -- the descriptive information that we presented at the last meeting. And I guess we're going to have to determine on -- you know, it would be a lot of -- a lot of work we have to do, forms on every single material. But Arthur --

CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: Arthur?

MR. NEAL: It will be very difficult for you to take -- we've placed the TAPs that were done in '95 through, what, '97 on the website, and it would be very difficult for you to fill out the evaluation forms with that information.

That's one of the reasons why sunset was set up with public comment in play -- to express the continued need for the substance. There's not much question concerning the use of the substance. Then, obviously, there's not a great concern about it.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	Now, for those that people have expressed
2	a concern for, to take it off, we don't want it
3	anymore, those may be the ones that you you have
4	time to really evaluate in depth, because for you to
5	fill out evaluation forms for over 160 plus materials
6	would take you from now until next year.
7	MS. KOENIG: So that was why the the
8	forms that we set up for the review process were based
9	on kind of a descriptive evaluation, and a description
10	of the comments that come in, to justify those that
11	would be simple.
12	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: Can I ask you, Rose,
13	to work with Arthur just to make sure you've got a
14	tool that's useable to committees and meets their
15	needs before it's distributed?
16	MS. KOENIG: Okay. Well, we approved it,
17	so we'll go over and look at it.
18	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: I understand we
19	approved kind of the content of it, but if it could be
20	in something really useable for committees to make it
21	painless, but yet it's thorough.
22	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: Okay.

MR. NEAL: One of the things that I want to comment on, I'd like for the committee chairs to submit those substances for Rose to send to us for additional clarification, that you really work with her to pinpoint the questions that you want addressed by contractors, because we're going to try to go to them this week or mid next week with those requests, because we don't want to waste time. Time is valuable now.

And they are already aware that they are going to be receiving them, but we need to give them clear instructions on what we want them to do with those substances. Particularly, we've got flavors and you've got --

MS. KOENIG: Colors.

MR. NEAL: -- and what we want them to look at, do we want them to look at manufacturing process, availability, because some things they may not be able to address. So we need to be kind of clear on what we -- what we want from them.

VICE CHAIRPERSON O'RELL: We're going to want a pretty full review on those items, because we

NEAL R. GROSS

1	haven't had any TAPs in the past. So, but we can
2	we can put together a list of some ideas and direction
3	for that.
4	MR. NEAL: Please do, because
5	manufacturing process is going to be important.
6	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: Okay. Any other
7	questions, comments?
8	MS. KOENIG: The only other comment is
9	when the chairpersons get your comments, if the first
10	your first committee meeting when you compile kind
11	of the information, if you could if there are
12	things where you're getting "we need a review, we need
13	a review, we need a review," those quickly again I
14	mean, because this first set of requests are those
15	that we've requested based on our own knowledge. The
16	second set of requests for any kind of technical
17	review is going to come from public comment.
18	But, again, as Arthur says, we need to get
19	that as soon as possible. Once you guys determine
20	that, then you can set up other committee meetings to
21	go through the ones where you where you have not

received any negative "pull off the list" comments.

1	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: Yes. Gerry?
2	MR. DAVIS: The materials that Arthur was
3	referring to that we need to get our comments to him
4	next week, obviously those aren't that's the ones
5	we've already pre-identified that he's referring to.
6	MS. KOENIG: Those, plus we may have
7	additional ones that, like Nancy mentioned, and
8	generated from public comment today or during this
9	meeting
10	MR. DAVIS: But not what has come in.
11	MS. KOENIG: Yes.
12	MR. DAVIS: We don't get that in time to
13	fulfill
14	MS. KOENIG: Well, that's what I'm saying.
15	That's what that's the next set. And as soon as
16	the chairpersons get hard copies and I'll try the
17	best I can to kind of go through them and help you
18	guys along, but that's the next immediate group that
19	we need to know about.
20	VICE CHAIRPERSON O'RELL: Or when you
21	start looking at them on the website to see if there
22	are any, because I don't

1	MS. KOENIG: Chairs will get hard copies
2	of all
3	VICE CHAIRPERSON O'RELL: What's the time
4	table for us getting hard copies?
5	MS. KOENIG: Like this week is
6	MR. NEAL: We'll try to mail those out to
7	you, if not the end of this week, the beginning of
8	next week, because I've been here, so I'm sure that
9	there are more comments that's been coming in.
10	VICE CHAIRPERSON O'RELL: Okay. good.
11	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: Okay. Everyone clear
12	on that? All right. Thanks, Rose.
13	As Board Chair, I have a few things to
14	report as far as work plan type items as well. And
15	that is coming out of this meeting, I do need to
16	submit the final recommendations from this meeting.
17	So before I can do that, I need the
18	committee chairs to funnel those in to me, and then I
19	need to review those and then complete that cover
20	sheet that has now been created and sign off on that.
21	So I do need your timely cooperation, assistance, to
22	get that done.

And then, I would like to, as I did after the last meeting, write a brief report of the meeting in a letter to the Secretary that just itemizes what we -- what we accomplished at this meeting and then also summarizes some of our future work plan items, just to keep it -- the attention there, that we are fulfilling our mandate under OFPA. So just to let you know that.

And then, there's one other item that we haven't discussed, and that is the role of the Board in the review of applicants for the Executive Director position. And Barbara and I I think really need to talk and come up with a plan for how we will be engaged in that.

You know, the last we know, the job description has gone to the Personnel Division, but it hasn't come back out yet. So we haven't seen the final job description, but we do need to have a plan and kind of form a subcommittee, kind of a personnel subcommittee I think, to be directly engaged in that process.

So I'll just need to work with Barbara and

NEAL R. GROSS

1	come up with that, and then report on that at the next
2	Executive Committee meeting.
3	So those were my three items that I wanted
4	to mention. Any questions for me? Gerry?
5	MR. DAVIS: The subcommittee you
6	mentioned, would you envision that be some outgoing
7	Board members and some new?
8	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: Yes, definitely. But
9	not the full executive I would imagine three people
10	probably. You don't want to get it too big. So I
11	guess, once again, if you're interested in that,
12	please let me know to begin with.
13	Yes, Nancy. I don't mean right now,
14	but
15	MS. OSTIGUY: My proximity to D.C. makes
16	that a possibility, that I could help out on that.
17	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: Okay. Thanks.
18	Okay. Now, the next item on our agenda is
19	to talk about our next meeting date. And let's
20	where that stands, does someone from the program have
21	some information for us?
22	MR. NEAL: That rests with Barbara. But

1	the potential dates I think you all know is that week
2	before Thanksgiving, the 14th through the 17th. Those
3	are the dates. Barbara, I think she said on Monday,
4	would let you know whether or not it's going to
5	happen.
6	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: Right. Yes, she said
7	by the end of the week, and I didn't know if she meant
8	by the week ending on Wednesday or Friday.
9	MR. NEAL: I don't
10	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: I was hoping that we
11	would have something by the end of this meeting.
12	MR. NEAL: I don't have the information.
13	MS. CAUGHLAN: Barbara left?
14	MR. NEAL: She's not in the room. She's
15	still in the hotel.
16	MS. JAMES: She had originally said the
17	14th/15th or 21st/22nd.
18	MR. NEAL: It's just the week of the 14th.
19	MS. CAUGHLAN: So it's maybe better.
20	PARTICIPANT: It's worse for me.
21	VICE CHAIRPERSON O'RELL: I won't be
22	there.

1	PARTICIPANT: I'm going to be out of the
2	country.
3	MR. SIEMON: Which days?
4	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: The 21st or
5	20th/21st sounds bad for Kevin and Dave right away.
6	And I really we aren't going to decide this. I
7	really don't want to engage much time.
8	MR. SIEMON: I'm sorry. But we have put
9	away three days, haven't we?
10	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: Yes. In pencil on
11	your calendar, the 14th through 17th, with the primary
12	focus being the sunset review, and then election of
13	officers. Those are two things that really have to
14	happen, unless you want me to be Chair for life.
15	PARTICIPANT: Sure.
16	MR. NEAL: And we just and what she has
17	conveyed, that there would be a two-day meeting, no
18	more than a two-day meeting. So, but those are the
19	range
20	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: Yes, the range.
21	Thanks. Yes, so it could be the 15th through 17th or
22	14th or 14th and 15th, 15th yes, it could be

two days within that range. All right.

Okay. I guess that's all we can decide on that. And I do have some closing remarks. I see the agenda has me down for a half hour.

(Laughter.)

I will be brief, but I do have some substantive remarks. I'd appreciate your continued patience and attention.

Well, first, I would just like to thank the USDA in general for the opportunity to serve, to provide advice and to serve. But in specific, I'd like to thank the staff, you know, for the work it takes to organize the meeting. And regardless of where the meeting is held, it's never perfect for everyone, and you're always going to receive some criticism.

But I want you to also receive appropriate thanks and acknowledgement for the work, not just in the logistics of the hotel, but all the copies, all the posting, all the assistance and the engagement, so that we can function as a Board.

And I also, as I said earlier in response

NEAL R. GROSS

to one of the commenters, am very encouraged by what I see is a manifestation of collaboration occurring. And in particular, the precedent of the line-by-line responses to the past meetings' recommendations I think that is very healthy, and for us to know where you stand on our recommendations.

And we do provide advice. We love it when that advice is taken. But there are times when it does need further work, and we appreciate having things sent back to us. And there might come a time when our advice is rejected, but we like to know if that's the case, too. But hopefully, if we're working together, we won't reach that point in the future, or the Board won't reach that in the future.

And I think this climate of engagement and collaboration is really critical for the rule changes that we face, in response to the court ruling but also some of these other significant issues on the table.

I do remain baffled and concerned by some of the positions that were taken yesterday in the discussion on the synthetics and substances not appearing on the list being allowed for use, the whole

A plus B plus C equals Q. I do question the legal basis for that interpretation in OFPA, especially in light of the court ruling. So I do have ongoing concerns about that equation.

I'd like to acknowledge some of my own shortcomings here in this meeting -- not looking to the left often enough. I rarely --

(Laughter.)

But I also, more importantly than that, is I did err in not asking for any interests on topics before they came up for discussion. And this isn't just a materials issue, but other topics as well. And I have reviewed the actions that we've taken at this meeting, and from what I know of Board members' interests, I find no interests that deserve recusal in any of the actions that we have taken at this meeting.

If you have any to correct, you know, please do so. But that's my analysis of the actions taken at this meeting.

I'd like to thank all of you, and there are still quite a few of you out there, who have come to this meeting. The room was packed to start the

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

public comment on Monday. People said holding an NOSB meeting in D.C. in the middle of August, who would come?

Well, people did, and that just shows me, once again, what an engaged community it is, and the importance of your continued involvement and in put. It's just so valuable to us, and I think you see that in the comments and questions after each of you have submitted your comments. They are taken very seriously, and empower and inform us to do a good job.

I am pleased by the progress of the two task forces that we have going on right now. I think they are making serious deliberations and considering different angles on both the aquaculture and pet food issues, and I think we'll have some valuable reports coming out of that process.

I really am pleased with the new members, how engaged you all have been. It's like you've been here, you know, longer than just one meeting now. So you definitely have lost any shyness and are fully engaged. So I appreciate that and really also want to thank all the veteran members for your continued

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

leadership and vision, commitment to this process.

It's a tremendous amount of work.

Oh, I did have a comment about the whole notion of any life form being seen as agricultural. I — that certainly is not consistent with the history of organic regulations, in this country or internationally. And I look at, where do you draw the line? And organic is about drawing the line when it comes to regulations.

know, three years is no magical number, but we draw a line in the sand to qualify for transition of land. We do need to draw lines on this definition eventually, one way or another, and there may be some winners and losers, some people disagree with that final outcome. But I look, you know, at earthworms, can we raise organic earthworms. Well, what about nematodes? What about amoebas? Τ mean, what about viruses?

And are prions life forms or not? I mean, we do need a line, and it can't just be all life forms qualify. And maybe we need to look in the, you know, Oxford or Webster Dictionary at agriculture, or look

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	at the Latin roots, and not just taxonomy, to help
2	clarify this situation.
3	I encourage the Board as we move forward,
4	as much as we can, to prioritize and keep a narrow
5	focus. I think whenever we do we accomplish things
6	well. When we get too scattered, it confuses the
7	public and isn't helpful for the program.
8	I just have tremendous respect and awe for
9	this process, and just the engagement of this Board
10	and the members of the public, and it's just an honor
11	to be a part of it.
12	So I would entertain a motion to adjourn.
13	VICE CHAIRPERSON O'RELL: So moved.
14	MS. OSTIGUY: Second.
15	CHAIRPERSON RIDDLE: Kevin moved to
16	adjourn. Nancy seconds. All in favor, say aye.
17	(Chorus of ayes.)
18	Those opposed?
19	(No response.)
20	Thank you very much.
21	(Whereupon, at 11:14 a.m., the proceedings
22	in the foregoing matter were adjourned.)